LEVEL ONE

The Church Quarterly Review

Edited by Philip Usher.

No. 229. OCTOBER 1932 Vol. CXV.

CONTENTS:

		PAGE
I.	THE FEAST OF THE NEW COVENANT. By Canon D. McLaren	1
II.	NATHAN SÖDERBLOM AS A THEOLOGIAN. By G. Aulén	15
III.	SAMUEL DAVIDSON'S WORK IN OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP. By Canon Box	49
IV.	HAMAN-AGOBARD OR ST. AGOBARD? By Canon A. Lukyn Williams	67
V.	THE BEARING OF THE 21st CHAPTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL ON ITS AUTHORSHIP. By H. P. V. Nunn	79
VI.	RICHARD PORSON. By Rev. E. J. Martin	96
	THE CHURCHES OF EUROPE	111
	REVIEWS	119
	SHORT NOTICES	146
	PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED	161

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific
LIBRARY

LONDON:
Published for the Proprietors by
THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
S.P.C.K. HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE W.C.
NEW YORK & TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO.

PRICE 6s. A COPY. SUBSCRIPTION PRICE 20s. PER ANNUM, POST-FREE

BY APPOINTMENT TO THE LATE
KING EDWARD VII . . .

STAINED GLASS WINDOWS
CHURCH DECORATIONS . .

Memorial Brasses
Mosaics - Tablets, Etc.

CHURCHES VISITED. ESTIMATES AND
DESIGNS FURNISHED FREE OF CHARGE.

Heaton, Butler & Bayne

14, GARRICK ST., LONDON, W.C.

AND NEW YORK

Illustrated List of Churches in all parts of the World, where examples of the firm's work may be seen, will be forwarded on application.

The most important religious book this Autumn will be

LITURGY AND WORSHIP

A companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion. Edited by *W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D.*, with the assistance of *Charles Harris, D.D.* Nearly 900 pp. 15s. net.

It is safe to prophesy that this great work will at once become, and long remain, indispensable to every clergyman and theological student of the Anglican Communion. The list of subjects and authors will suffice to show that an epoch-making work is here offered to the Church. Its importance for the future of the Anglican Communion can hardly be over-estimated.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

Volume I.: Standards. Edited by *Oscar Hardmann, D.D.*, About 400 pp. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

This book, with the second volume already published (Discipline), makes a complete manual for the clergy of moral and spiritual conduct. Those who study both volumes will be able to put the special problems of the clergy in dealing with souls as a background of general moral teaching. But the first volume, as will be seen by the contents, contains material which will be of great value to all those who are puzzled by the moral chaos of our times.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, and
43 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C. (near Mansion House Station)
And of all Booksellers

The Church Quarterly Review Advertiser

OCTOBER 1932

Advertisements for the C.Q.R. should be sent to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2

FROM MOWBRAYS' LIST

JUST PUBLISHED

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND AFTER.
By the Rev. C. P. S. CLARKE, M.A., Prebendary of Salisbury. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 8s. 6d. (*Post 6d.*)

A comprehensive survey of the Catholic Revival from its beginnings to the present time, written by a leading Church historian and based on original sources.

EVERY MAN'S STORY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.
By the Rev. T. DILWORTH-HARRISON, M.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Brighton. 2s. 6d. (*Post 3d.*)

An account of the Movement written for popular reading by a well-known Anglo-Catholic priest.

DISCIPLESHIP AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.
A study in the Mission of Christ and His Church. By the Rev. EDWARD C. RICH, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Chief Diocesan Inspector of Schools. Cloth, 5s. (*Post 4d.*)

An attempt to base the obligation of Christian Worship on the revelation of God in Christ.

PASTORAL LECTURES OF BISHOP EDWARD KING.
Edited with an Introduction by the Rev. ERIC GRAHAM, M.A., Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. 1s. 6d. (*Post 1½d.*)

Notes of lectures delivered by Dr King as Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford. They will still be found of great value to ordinands and to many of the clergy.

WE ARE ABLE: The living of the Christian Life. By the Rev. JAMES WAREHAM, B.A., author of *An Ordered Life*, etc. Cloth, 3s. 6d. (*Post 3½d.*)

Practical suggestions for the development of the Christian life.

THE GOLDEN PROLOGUE.
By the Rev. W. H. G. HOLMES, of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the Epiphany; Author of *The Glory of God*, etc. 1s. 6d. (*Post 2d.*)

Meditations on the first fourteen verses of the Gospel according to St. John.

THE PASTOR AND HIS GUIDE. Counsels on the Parochial Ministry.
By the Rev. E. F. ODLING, Vicar of Coley, Halifax. With an Introduction by THE BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD. 1s. 6d. (*Post 1½d.*)

"Very sound and practical suggestions about the work of the parish priest.... This is a book worth reading."—*Church Times.*

REUNION AND NONCONFORMITY.
By the Rev. W. G. PECK, author of *Catholicism and Humanity*. 2s. 6d. (*Post 3d.*)

"Mr Peck has the best possible right to deal with the Reunion problem. He has been a Methodist minister, and is now an Anglican priest. He has broad sympathies, clear sight, a generous heart."—*Theology.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., Ltd., 28, Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, London, W.1; and 9, High Street, Oxford

KING'S COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY)

Dean—The Rev. R. HANSON, M.A., B.D.

FACULTY *of* THEOLOGY

The Degree of B.D. in the University can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' study, by other Matriculated Students after three years.

Theology may also be taken as one subject for the General B.A. Examinations.

The Associateship of King's College is accepted by most Bishops as the academic qualification for admission to Holy Orders. It can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two years' Theological study; by others who have passed certain examinations at school, or later, after three years' study; and by others after a year of Preliminary study and the three years' ordinary Theological course.

Post-graduate work in Theology for B.D. Hons., Ph.D. and D.D. is directed by each Professor.

There are Entrance Exhibitions both for Graduates and for other Students.

King's College Hostel, Vincent Square, Westminster, offers the advantages of residence.

Women Students are admitted to the Theological Department to read for the B.D. or the Lambeth Diploma (S.Th.).

Staff

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY: Rev. H. M. RELTON, D.D., Professor.

EXEGESIS OF NEW TESTAMENT: Rev. Preb. E. J. BICKNELL, M.A., D.D., Professor; EDWYN R. BEVAN, M.A., D. Litt., LL.D.; Rev. R. V. G. TASKER, M.A., Lecturers.

HEBREW AND EXEGESIS OF OLD TESTAMENT: Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Professor; S. H. HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. Canon G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D., Professor Emeritus; Rev. F. J. HOLLIS, D.D., Lecturer.

SYRIAC, ARAMAIC AND RABBINICAL HEBREW: Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., D.D., Professor; S. H. HOOKE, M.A., B.D., Samuel Davidson Professor; Rev. Canon G. H. BOX, M.A., D.D., Professor Emeritus; Rev. F. J. HOLLIS, D.D. Lecturer.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY: Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, M.A., D.D., F.S.A., Professor.

PATRISTIC TEXTS: Rev. Canon CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A.; Rev. R. V. G. TASKER, M.A., Lecturers.

PASTORAL AND LITURGICAL THEOLOGY: Rev. O. HARDMAN, M.A., D.D., Professor; Rev. C. F. ROGERS, M.A., Professor Emeritus; Rev. W. B. DAMS, M.A., Lecturer.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION: Rev. R. HANSON, M.A., B.D. Rev. Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Lit., Professor Emeritus; Rev. F. H. SMITH, D.D., Lecturer.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART: Rev. Canon PERCY DEARMER, M.A., D.D., Professor.

TUTOR TO WOMEN STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY: Miss E. W. HIPPISLEY, S.Th.

CHAPLAIN: Rev. C. F. ROGERS, M.A.

FEES ... ... **£32 a year**

Evening Classes ... ... **£15 15s. 0d. a year**

There is no entrance fee.

For residence at Hostel ... ... **£66 a year**

For full information apply to the DEAN, KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND, LONDON, W.C. 2

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 229 OCTOBER 1932 VOL. CXV

REVIEWS

Deuteronomy, The Framework of the Code. By ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., p. 119.—*Die Theologie Gersons.* By WALTER DRESS, p. 123.—*Die Menschheitsbedeutung Jesu bei Martin Kähler.* By HEINRICH PETEAN, p. 123.—*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft.* By HERMANN GUNKEL and LEOPOLD ZSCHARNACK, p. 124.—*The Elements of the Spiritual Life.* By F. P. HARTON, p. 126.—*Peter Abailard.* By J. G. SIKES, p. 129.—*The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth.* By HAROLD SMITH, D.D., p. 131.—*Supernatural Religion in its Relation to Democracy.* By S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., p. 133.—*The Life of George Eliot.* By EMILIE and GEORGES ROMIEU, p. 140.—*The New Morality.* By G. E. NEWSOM, p. 142.

SHORT NOTICES

Die drei Männer im Feuer. By CURT KUHL, p. 146.—*Die Mischna : Dammai, Moed qatan, Qinnim,* p. 147.—*St. Germaine of the Wolf Country.* By HENRI GHÉON, p. 147.—*Church and Gnosis.* By F. C. BURKITT, p. 147.—*Alexandrine Teaching on the Universe.* By R. B. TOLLINTON, p. 147.—*Christianity in Celtic Lands.* By DOM LOUIS GOUGAUD, p. 148.—*The Columban Church.* By DR. JOHN A. DUKE, p. 148.—*The Letters of Queen Victoria,* 1886–1901 : *The Last Years,* 1896–1901. By GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE, p. 151. *Father Tyrrell and the Modernist Movement.* By J. LEWIS MAY, p. 152.—*The Italian Reformers* 1534–1564. By F. C. CHURCH, p. 154.—*Establishment in England : being Essays on Church and State.* By SIR LEWIS DIBDEN, D.C.L., p. 156.—*Mysticism, East and West.* By RUDOLF OTTO, p. 156.—*Lyra Mystica.* By C. C. ALBERTSON, p. 159.—*A Professional Christian.* By J. C. HARDWICK, p. 159.—*The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason. Edited by* LEONARD WHIBLEY, p. 160.

PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED 161

The Bible, the Scholar and the Spade

by

C. H. IRWIN, M.A., D.D.

7/6 net

A summary of the results of modern excavation and discovery

"The writer shows how Egyptian and Babylonian accounts of the Creation contrast or coincide with that given in Genesis, how the cuneiform inscriptions throw light on the story of Eden and of the Flood, how greatly our knowledge of Abraham and his times has increased, and how the epic of Moses fits in with what we know of Egyptian history."—*News Chronicle.*

Published at 4 Bouverie St., London, E.C.4

From all Booksellers

SKEFFINGTONS' NEW BOOKS

SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

Canon H. L. GOUDGE, D.D. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University.

A new volume of Thirty Sermons by this well-known preacher, including four for Advent, Lent, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Day, The Sundays after Trinity, The Annunciation, The Transfiguration. Harvest Festival, Sundays after Armistice Day, Dedication Festival, etc., etc.
These striking Addresses will prove of great value not only to the Clergy and Church people, but will be welcomed by many of Dr Goudge's old pupils.

Prices **6/-** *net (postage 4d.)*

FAMOUS HYMNS: Their Writers and Tunes

Rev. J. LIONEL BENNETT, M.A. Vicar of Dodington, Kent.

A most attractive volume of Addresses on some fifty well-known Hymns. Mr Bennett, who is an expert hymnologist, deals with the glamour, romance and teaching of some great Hymns of the Church, and writes with authority concerning the hymn-tunes. Among the 40 to 50 Hymns included are some of the great hymns from the Latin and also a few of recent date such as Kipling's "God of our Fathers," and Arkwrights, "O Valiant Hearts," as well as many of the most famous and popular in the current Hymnals.

Price **7/6** *net (postage 4d.)*

EVERYDAY RELIGION FOR THE PLAIN MAN

Rev. L. B. ASHBY, M.A. Author of "A Reasonable Faith for a Plain Man"

A new volume of Fifty Readings by this popular author. The Addresses include all the principal Church Seasons, five on the Gospels, seven on the Prayer Book and Catechism and a large number on general subjects.
It is confidently expected that this new book by Mr Ashby will achieve the same success as his previous works. It should prove of the greatest help to clergy and lay people.

Price **3/6** *net (postage 3d.)*

PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY

Rev. BASIL G. BOURCHIER, M.A. Rector of St. Anne, Soho.

A Series of direct and out-spoken articles by this well-known writer on some of the most pressing Problems which are perplexing the world to-day. The Author writes: "I make no claim to be an iconoclast, or indeed, anything more than a student of some of life's more serious problems, but I do claim—most emphatically—the liberty of expressing myself unhampered by any 'made-to-measure' ethics of the present century."
The Subjects include:—Why has the Church failed?—The Problems of Pain and Evil—War—Money and Labour—Sunday Cinemas and Games—Sweepstakes—Marriage and Birth Control—Divorce and Justice—Prohibition, etc.

Ready Oct. 7th. Price **6/-** *net. (postage 4d.)*

HAZARDS AND HAPPENINGS

JOHN HORNE

The aim of this book is to inspire and encourage those who have become entangled in the perplexities of life. Each chapter, which is singularly entertaining and lucid, introduces ingenious themes which fortify the wearied mind. If you are disheartened or confused, this is the book for you. It abounds in sound and genial guidance for all classes of life's wayfarers.

Price **2/6** *net (postage 3d.)*

THE KEBLE BOOKS

A series of ten books, edited by The Reverend Desmond Morse-Boycott, and issued in connection with the Centenary of the Oxford Movement.

Price of each volume is **3/6** *net (postage 3d.)*

Prospectuses giving details of this series obtainable upon application

THE MODERNIST SERIES

A series of plain and straightforward books on the Modernist Outlook on Religion. They are written in popular language and are intended to appeal to all classes of people.

Price of each volume is **3/6** *net (postage 3d.)*

Prospectuses giving details of this series obtainable upon application

SKEFFINGTON & SON, LTD., Paternoster House, St. Paul's, E.C.4

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. CCXXIX.—OCTOBER 1932

Art. I.—THE FEAST OF THE NEW COVENANT

The Epistle to the Hebrews. International Critical Commentary Series. By Dr James Moffatt. *Cambridge Greek Testament.* By Dr A. Nairne.

I.

One of the first things which a student of the New Testament is likely to do, on taking up a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, is to turn to the passage, ch. ix, 16, 17, in order to see what the author will make of those much debated verses, and to see, especially, what meaning he will attach to the word *διαθήκη*, on which the interpretation of the passage turns.

The word occurs about thirty times in the New Testament. In rather more than half the places in which it is found, the A.V. renders it by "Covenant"; in rather less than half, by "Testament." In the R.V. it is almost invariably translated "Covenant," there being only two instances in which the other word is used.

It may seem remarkable, at first sight, that a single Greek word should have to do duty for the two English words and to express the two things for which those words stand, for the Greek language is rich and the Greeks were as exact and clear in their thinking as any race has ever been. Commentators on this passage are content, as a rule, with noting the fact that in Greek there is but one word to cover the two ideas, and, usually, they "leave it at that."

It is, perhaps, worth while asking how it came about that the Greeks managed with one word where it appears to us that two are necessary.

The answer, surely, is that in this matter the Greeks were not guilty of a lapse from their normally exact and logical thinking. To us a "will" or "testament" is a thing obviously distinct and different from a "covenant," or, as it might be called North of the Tweed, a "paction." To the ancient world, however, the distinction was not felt, and the two things were of the same nature.

A man making his will was regarded as making an agreement, or a covenant, with the persons whom he constituted his heirs. On certain conditions, laid down on his side, and accepted on theirs, they became entitled to his property. He might require of them the performance of some religious rite for the benefit of his departed spirit, or he might require of them the care of some object or of some individual belonging to him. The condition might be (for it was, no doubt, sometimes, with the wills of ancient, as it sometimes is with the wills of modern, times) an unreasonable or an eccentric or a vexatious one. But there it was; and the legatee could only obtain the property by accepting the condition. The will, that is to say, had about it, the true nature of a covenant, and the Greeks were not mentally clumsy or confused when they called it by that name. That is precisely what it was.

With us, however, the ideas which are associated with a covenant and with a will do not coincide, and it becomes a question which of the two English terms is to be used in those New Testament passages in which the single word διαθήκη appears—particularly in the famous passage referred to in Heb. ix.

The Revisers, as has been said, resolved that the word to be systematically used should be "covenant," and they kept to their decision except in two places where their heart failed them.

As we are all aware, the word which appears in the R.V. accounts of the Institution of the Eucharist is "Covenant."

" This is my blood of the New Covenant," and the correctness of that rendering is scarcely open to doubt. The Institution of the Eucharist signified the inauguration of a new Covenant between God and man, and the sacred writings which are, at once, the record and the result of it, are rightly called the Books of the New Covenant.

It is with this New Covenant that the writer to the Hebrews is dealing in chs. viii, ix, x. Ten times in the course of these chapters the word διαθήκη is used in connection with it. In every instance, except two, " Covenant " is the word chosen by the Revisers. Those two exceptions are to be found in the verses which concern us (ch. ix, 16, 17). The translation runs thus :

> " For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death, for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth ? "

It is noted in the R.V. margin that the Greek word " signifies both covenant and testament." It is further suggested that instead of " where there hath been death " the rendering should be " over the dead," and that " doth it ever avail ? " should be " it doth never avail."

The point, however, is that in the actual text the Revisers, although with some hesitation, have given their vote for " testament," not for " covenant."

The decision in favour of " testament " reached by the Revisers appears to commend itself to the greater number of English expositors and translators, some of them admitting, however, that there is something to be said for the other rendering.

Dr Moffatt, for example, in his recently published Commentary in the International Critical Commentary Series, states that the writer " uses διαθήκη as equivalent to ' will ' or ' testamentary disposition,' " adding, however, on the next page that

> " no natural interpretation of vv. 15–20 is possible when διαθήκη is understood rigidly as a covenant or as a will."

Dr Nairne, in his little edition of the Epistle, considers that the point may be left doubtful. Prof. E. F. Scott, writing in Dr Peake's one volume Commentary, holds that "it is to the analogy of a will or testament that the writer is appealing." The same is the view of Mr S. C. Gayford who is the writer on the Epistle in Bishop Gore's Commentary. He, however, expresses himself without hesitation, thus:

> "The language of the author makes the translation 'testament' necessary to give sense to the passage";

and,

> "no satisfactory explanation can be given to the words 'Doth it ever avail while the testator liveth?' if the translation 'covenant' be retained."

Against this collection of opinions must be set that of Mr F. Rendall as given in his edition of the Epistle published as long ago as 1883.

> "This section of the Epistle deals largely with the subject of the two διαθήκαι; but to both the idea of a testament, a testator, still more the death of a testator is wholly foreign."

The purpose of what immediately follows is to contend that the uncertainty as to the real meaning of the word felt by many writers is altogether uncalled-for, and that those who take the view of Dr Moffatt, Dr Nairne, Prof. Scott and Mr Gayford and interpret διαθήκη in the sense of "testament" are demonstrably wrong.

Let it be said at once that it is in no sense surprising that translators should have yielded to the temptation to make the writer of the Epistle speak of a will. What he is made to say about it is undoubtedly true. It is a fact that a will or a testament becomes operative only when the man who made it is dead. A man may make a will and, having made it, he may modify or revoke it. He frequently does. His feeling towards the friends or relatives whom he intended to make his legatees may change. His will may have been drawn up in proper form: he may have signed it with his own hand, but until he is actually in his grave, nothing can happen under it. No one, it is quite

true, derives any benefit from it " while the testator liveth."[1]

That is quite true. Unhappily—for this translation—however, it is also quite irrelevant. The subject before the mind of the writer at this point in the Epistle is the contrast between the ancient Covenant inaugurated through Moses and the new Covenant made with men through Jesus Christ. His thought is very nearly that of St. Paul who, in the Epistle to the Galatians, opposes the covenant made through Moses, and based on " works," to the Covenant of Grace made with us through the Eternal Son, and resting on the basis of faith. It would seem, surely, *prima facie*, that in these verses διαθήκη is intended to bear the same sense as in the entire passage to which they belong.

It might be recalled, further, in a parenthesis, that to speak of a will in connection with our Lord Jesus Christ would be, in any case, inappropriate. Our Lord, as a matter of fact, made and left no will. How should he, having no riches or property to give away ? He is sometimes said to be " bequeathed " to his followers the " legacy " of persecution or the " legacy " of peace. But in saying that, we are using figurative language and are referring to matters which were certainly not in this writer's mind. He is, it must be repeated, thinking of the two covenants ; and to bring in references to a will and to the conditions which have to be fulfilled before a will becomes effective is to go aside from the subject in hand and to complicate it by the introduction of matter which is, as Mr Rendall urged, " wholly foreign."

Taking, then, the word " covenant " for the word to be used in these verses, as the nature of the argument requires that we should, we have to ask " What exactly does it mean ? "

It hardly needs to be pointed out that, even when we have substituted " covenant " for " testament," the rendering of the R.V., as well as that of the A.V., is inexact. The

[1] I have here, to express my obligation to an unpublished paper on this subject by the late Canon Rayner Winterbotham, some paragraphs of which are, by permission, reproduced in the first section of this article.

writer does not say that a covenant is of force, either "after men are dead" or "where there hath been death," but ἐπὶ νεκρῶις, "over dead bodies," *i.e.*, over the bodies of slain victims. He goes on, in words which sound a little strange to English ears: "Otherwise it is of no force at all while the covenant maker liveth." Is that true? "Surely," we should have said, "a covenant between two men is binding only so long as they are alive. How can they fulfil the conditions and obligations of the covenant when they are no longer here to do it?"

The explanation of the verse given in Mr Rendall's commentary is that it is "highly elliptical." He elucidates what seems to him to be the writer's thought by the following translation:

> "Where a covenant is made, death of him that makes it must be the forfeit offered. For a covenant is ratified upon dead victims; for is it strong at a time when he that makes it lives *after breaking it?*"

It is hard to think that if the writer intended the words in italics to be understood he would not have supplied them himself.

Mr Rendall appears to have missed the particular meaning of the primitive custom according to which an agreement between two parties whether individuals or tribes or nations was ratified by death. In all parts of the world anthropologists have found traces of the custom. A victim was solemnly slain and over the slaughtered animal the covenant was made firm, the particular point being this: the slaying of the animal by which the covenant was ratified was a symbolical act. It represented something: and the "something" which it represented was the death of the parties to the covenant. Their death, represented in a figure was necessary to the validity of the covenant. So the writer himself says

> "Where a covenant is there must of necessity *be represented*[1] the death of him that made it."

[1] δεῖι φέρεσθαι

Why was this ritual necessary ? For this reason :

A man who has made a will may, as was said above, change his mind. He may decide not to leave his money to the people mentioned in his original will. A man who has entered into a covenant may also change his mind. He may repent of the agreement by which he has bound himself, he may ignore or repudiate it. Men have been known to disown their promises as nations have been known to ignore their treaties. There is only one man of whom you can be quite sure that he will never be untrue to his word or go back upon it : that is the man who is dead. He can never break his vow or violate his pledge. Therefore, in order to give complete security to the covenant it was necessary that both parties should die upon it. Then it would be safe from the dangers and uncertainties to which it was liable owing to the vacillations of shifting and untrustworthy men.

Well, it was clearly impossible that the parties should actually die, and that they should, at the same time, actually be in a position to fulfil their covenant obligations. They could, however, die ritually and in a figure. This they not only could do, but they did.

A victim was taken by the two makers of the covenant, representing both sides and accepted by both, and was solemnly slain. This being done, the two parties were, in an ideal, if not in a literal sense, dead. With both of them dead, the covenant was secure. Men, as long as they are alive, have at least the opportunity of breaking their promises : they cannot be trusted : they cannot even trust themselves. But when they are dead and gone, their word is no longer in danger from the weakness or caprice of this uncertain human nature which is as inconstant as the wind and never continues in one stay.

Such was the ancient custom and such was the argument or theory underlying it.

The custom, it may be recalled meets us in the pages of the Old Testament. It is to be seen in the remarkable account given in the book of Genesis (ch. xv, 9–18), of the

covenant made by God with Abraham. In order to give solemnity and stability to the covenant, God is represented as condescending to make it sure, on his side, by lending to it the binding force of death. "Take me," he bids Abraham,

> "an heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon."

Abraham obeys. The animals are slain, their bodies divided, and the pieces placed one over against another. Abraham's part is now finished. But what of God and of his part? The narrative goes on (v. 17),

> "And it came to pass, that, when the sun went down and it was dark, behold, a smoking furnace, and a flaming torch that passed between those pieces."

Through them, or between them, passed the flaming torch symbolizing the Divine presence[1]; showing by God's own participation in the ritual that he assented to it and to what it signified. Thus, not Abraham only, but God himself, died a ritual death in order that the covenant might stand sure and unchangeable for ever.

This narrative from Genesis takes us back to the beginnings of Old Testament history, but centuries later the custom is referred to as being still in existence. We read of it in Jer. xxxiv, 18–20.

> "I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof—the princes of Judah and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs and the priests and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf—I will even give them up into the hand of their enemies and into the hand of those that seek their life, and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven and to the beasts of the earth."

[1] Cf. the radiance of the glory of the Shekinah in later Jewish literature and tradition.

Here, again, is a covenant ratified by a ritual death, the violation of which is to the prophet the darkest form of impiety and sacrilege.

Thus, according to primitive custom, and primitive conception, it was necessary that the parties to a covenant should die, at least an idea and symbol, if the covenant was to be fixed and firm.

Hence the covenant at Sinai required and received the ritual consecration of death. It was sealed by the blood of animal victims. Hence, also, the New Covenant carries with it the assurance of its own permanent validity, for it was consecrated by the death of One who represented both contracting parties, One who bears the double title and the double nature, of Son of God and Son of Man, the man, Christ Jesus.

I submit with confidence that it is not really doubtful that these ideas are in the background of the mind of the writer to the Hebrews; and that the meaning to be given to *διαθήκη* in the verses under discussion, instead of being open to question, is certainly the sense of "covenant."

II.

One of the present day problems of New Testament criticism is that which centres round the words used by our Lord on the occasion of the Last Supper. As is well known, no two reports of his words agree together—the accounts given by the Synoptists and by St. Paul all differing the one from the other. It appears certain, however, that the words "Do this," which have stood as the authority in obedience to which the Church has made the celebration of the Eucharist the chief feature of its worship, belong only to the third Gospel and to St. Paul. Further, inasmuch as that Gospel is acknowledged to reflect the spirit and teaching of St. Paul, and he may be said to stand behind it as St. Peter is supposed to stand behind the Gospel of St. Mark, it has to be admitted as a possibility that the words in question may be present in St. Luke's account through the transmission of them to him by St. Paul.

Now St. Paul was, of course, not an eye-witness of what he is here narrating. The event itself, also, took place many years before the time when the Epistle to the Corinthians was written, from which facts the conclusion has been drawn that the accounts given by the first two Synoptists are more likely to be exact, that the definite command to repeat and perpetuate the Supper was, in reality, not given, and that it is by what may be called a mistake that it has gained the place which it actually holds in the life and worship of the Church.

Now, in regard to this, we observe at once two facts.

1. Whether any specific command of the kind contained in I Corinthians and in the third Gospel was, or was not, given, the Eucharist seems to have formed part of Christian practice and experience from almost the moment of the Church's birth. For some reason, at any rate, she celebrated the rite certainly every Lord's day, and she had been doing it already for a number of years before any of the New Testament accounts of the institution were in existence. In other words, what she did was not done as the result of a mistaken inference from anything contained in the narratives of which the correctness is challenged. The question of their correctness is one for criticism and for the critics; but for our present purpose it has no application, since it was clearly in independence of them that the Eucharist became an integral part of the Church's life.

2. Although the accounts of the Institution which have come down to us are not at one, there is one point on which they are agreed. In all four accounts our Lord is represented as declaring that the significance of the moment lay in its marking the establishment of the new Covenant—that New Covenant spoken of by Jeremiah, which the writer to the Hebrews identifies with the Christian system. That aspect or meaning of the event in the Upper Room made, it would seem, a profound impression on the mind of the first Christian community, and led to its being imbedded, in all four accounts of that memorable night which were subsequently written. We can hardly be wrong

in supposing that it was, at least in part, by reason of that Covenant-aspect, emphasized by all four writers, that the Eucharist established itself as the rite to be performed and repeated by the Church, until her Lord's coming again.

How are we to interpret it in this aspect ?

One mode of effecting a covenant was, as the passage which we have been considering reminds us, by death. Another way was by the way of a meal of which the two contracting parties partook.

In the view of the first Christians, apparently, the Eucharist renewed, on every occasion of its being celebrated, that covenant into which every Christian was, at his baptism introduced, but to which, in spite of what his baptism implied, he was never completely loyal. The Covenant-parties in this case are still God and man. It is *ex hypothesi*, by a meal, in which both parties join, that the covenant is re-made. Man is, obviously and visibly, a partaker, that of which he eats and drinks being bread and wine ; but bread which is the " communion of the Body of Christ," and wine which is the " communion of the Blood of Christ." Christ, that is to say, is his food. But what of the other party to the Covenant ? God ; in what sense can he be said or supposed to be a partaker with man at the same table, and of what can he be said or supposed to partake ?

There is a phrase in St. John vi which should be remembered in this connection. Our Lord, in that chapter, is said to have referred to himself as " the Bread of God." That phrase, when it is thought to require any explanation at all, is interpreted as meaning the Bread which God supplies. Now, " the Bread of God " is an Old Testament phrase. It is to be found, four or five times repeated in Levit. xxi, and there is no room for doubt that it means, in that chapter, not the bread which God provides, but the bread which is provided for him. Is there any valid reason against taking the same phrase in the same sense, the same phrase in the discourse in the Synagogue at Capernaum ? Is not our Lord referring to himself as the food which God

consumes, or, if that phrase has too anthropomorphic a ring, as the food which satisfies God ?

The application of this to the Eucharist is obvious. The Eucharist is the Covenant-meal. In it we eat of a food of which God may be said to be a partaker also, since he who there satisfies the hunger of the human soul satisfies, in so doing, the hunger of the divine heart.

" In so doing." I shall return to that phrase in a moment. Meanwhile, in support of the interpretation just suggested, of the title " the Bread of God," it is relevant to recall St. Paul's phrase " the Lord's Table," in I Cor. x, 25. Those words, after the analogy of " the Bread of God " are taken commonly as equivalent to " the table which the Lord (*i.e.*, our Lord Jesus Christ) prepares or provides for us." So, for instance, in the familiar hymn :

" Author of life divine
Who hast a table spread."

But two things should be noticed. First, " the Lord's table " is used in a sense evidently parallel to " the table of demons " in the same verse. Now, " the table of demons " can only mean the table which is set for them and at which they feed. " The Lord's table " must bear a corresponding sense. It is the table at which he eats. Secondly, St. Paul here uses no article before the word " Lord." When he applies the title to the glorified Christ, his custom is to prefix the article. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that he is here using the term Lord exactly after the manner of the lxx. In the lxx version, as every one is aware, κύριος is the normal rendering for the divine name Jehovah. St. Paul, therefore, it is to be supposed, means that the table at which we eat, in the Eucharistic meal is a true Covenant table. God is present at it as well as we, and present as a partaker of the meat by which we are strengthened and he, himself, is satisfied.

To return to what was said in the last paragraph but one : he who in the Eucharist satisfies the hunger of the human soul, satisfies, " in so doing," the hunger of the Divine heart. Attention is called to the words in St. John vi

which accompany our Lord's description of himself as the Bread of God. They are these :

> " The Bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world."

It is implied that the fact of his giving life unto the world is that which makes him to be the acceptable and satisfying food of God—a thought which has its parallel in the words " therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life." In the Eucharist, as is, and as always has been, admitted on all hands, it is as the Christ living and life-giving that we come to him, and he to us, and by the incessant giving of himself to be our inward life, he incessantly satisfies the deepest desire of the Father's will which is that all men should be saved.

This thought of Christ as the acceptable food of God in the Eucharist, expressed at the beginning of Christian history in terms of the covenant-meal came, in later days, to be worked out in terms, and along the line of, sacrifice, in a way marked by a departure from the idea on which the covenant-theology laid its emphasis.

In the Covenant-theology stress is laid upon the actual meal, the actual partaking of the sacred gifts, for it is by joining together in the same feast and by partaking of the same food that God and man are brought into a perpetually renewed condition of friendship. In the sacrificial theology the emphasis has tended to be laid elsewhere, and explanations of the manner in which a satisfying offering is made to God have been given which it is painful to recall. That last painful fact, however, does not concern us. The point is that, in so far as the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is concerned, the movement of thought has been away from the reception of the consecrated gifts, the actual communion, as the central moment of the rite, to the consecration, or the fraction, or the elevation of the Host.

It is significant, however, that St. Paul connects the " shewing-forth " or the " proclaiming " of the Lord's death, definitely with the reception of the Bread and of the

Cup, nor does he give us any reason for thinking that this applies only to a "proclaiming" made before men and that he would have given another account of the "proclaiming" which looks towards God and heaven.

The students of comparative religion who have held that the heart and centre of the sacrificial ritual lies in the sacrificial meal may, or may not, be historically correct. St. Paul, however—so it seems—held that it is true of the rite which is the Memorial of the Eternal Sacrifice, and that it is by partaking of the same food as is offered to his God that the worshipper is brought into restored fellowship and covenant with him. For Christ the Son is both the food of God and the food of man. He is the first because he is the second, and in the Eucharist God and man meet at the same table, and eating together of the same bread, are at one.

DOUGLAS MCLAREN.

Art. II.—NATHAN SÖDERBLOM AS A THEOLOGIAN.

As the years went by, the labours of Nathan Söderblom's busy life came to be centred more and more in the gigantic task of Ecumenical work ; and his permanent place in the history of the Church will above all be that of a pioneer of Christian unity. Yet his wide-flung endeavours in the service of the Church Universal never lost touch with theology ; to the end of his days he was a theologian in heart and mind. It is an amazing fact that the thousand responsibilities of his archiepiscopal office involved no slackening in his theological production. He regarded it as a refreshing tonic when in the last winter of his life he was able to set aside a few months—or was it after all only a few weeks ?—for undisturbed study in preparation for the Gifford Lectures which he delivered at Edinburgh in the spring of 1931. In an address given to students at Copenhagen during his archiepiscopal period on the scientific study of theology, he said that he had chosen this subject largely for personal reasons ;

> " the best of my powers," he said, " have been devoted to the scientific study of religion, and no part of my very miscellaneous activity, which nevertheless is at bottom one in purpose, has brought me a purer happiness."

This address testifies to his remarkably clear view of the nature and aims of theological study. But it was the very fact that this study had for him no ulterior object beyond the elucidation of its subject-matter, that made it an indispensable aid to his ecumenical work. Without the background thus provided his ecumenical work would not have been possible ; and it cannot be rightly understood, unless it is seen in the light of his theology.

In the book of essays of which this paper forms part,[1] Söderblom's ecumenical work and his own special studies in the History of Religions both receive separate treatment. In this essay it will only be possible to sketch in outline the course of his theological development; we shall see to what an extent his earlier ideas came to be both modified and deepened in his later work.

Söderblom's student years came at a period when German theology in particular was developing a very remarkable activity. It was a lively period for biblical exegesis and the history of dogma; Wellhausen was in his prime, and the first edition of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* was just coming out. A. Ritschl was still at work; his theological influence had penetrated everywhere in Germany, and had in fact come to dominate the theological situation. W. Herrmann, the next most important systematic theologian of this school after Ritschl himself, published just at this time *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott.*

But the Uppsala professors were out of contact with this theological activity; or in so far as they were in contact with it, their attitude was hostile or non-committal. Their outlook was mainly traditionalistic and low-church. The Theological Faculty included indeed men of mark and originality, such as Myrberg and Rudin; but the interests of the latter of these were homiletic and pastoral, and the former stood outside the main stream of the scientific theology of the day. The first hesitating attempts at the critical study of the Scriptures were being made by J. A. Ekman; and the only important converts to the Ritschlian theology were to be found elsewhere in Sweden, Pehr Eklund at Lund, and Fredrik Fehr at Stockholm.

It was natural that so alert and active a mind as Söderblom's should seek contact with the most powerful movements of contemporary theology. In company with two friends, S. A. Fries and N. J. Göransson, he studied the

[1] *Nathan Söderblom: In Memoriam.* Edited by Nils Karlström. Stockholm, 1931. The other two essays referred to are contributed by Professor Yngve Brilioth and Professor Tor Andrae respectively.

Ritschlian theology and accepted its fundamental outlook. In a book written in 1919[1] he tells us how he was chiefly attracted by the Ritschlian teaching on the Kingdom of God and the ethical outlook.

> " For my own part," he writes, " I can fix the moment when I gained a new insight ; it was one evening thirty years ago, when I was sitting in the Students' Library at Uppsala, below the Gustavianum, reading a review in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. I did not understand it all. But I saw that God's Kingdom and God's action were put in the central place. A light seemed to come over me in the room where I sat, and a new gladness. We were not to put our trust in a book ; God had through Christ established his Kingdom, and this work of God included also the writing of the Scriptures. Christianity was no longer the religion of a Book, but a historical revelation, perfected in Christ . . . Together with the idea of God's Kingdom, the teaching of Jesus and its demand took a central place. The Sermon on the Mount belonged no longer to the forecourt of the sanctuary ; with the Cross, it stood in the Holy Place itself, and these two were not to be separated. The figure of the Christ regained authority and power—not the gentle Saviour, but a Christianity with a stern vigour and a moral backbone. God's work was firmly planted in the midst of history, in the much discussed historical Christ ; at the same time, in this theology, spirituality and mysticism were for the time being rather crowded out. But since then a new spirituality has come to birth, where the hard steel of the ideal strikes sparks."

A characteristic note is added :

> " We should have understood matters more clearly, and have grasped the idea of the Kingdom more organically and dynamically, less in a positivist way, if we had seen from the beginning that the subject of the Great Sermon would be better rendered ' God's Reign ' than ' God's ' Kingdom '."

[1] *Kristi församlings väg i denna tid* (The Way of Christ's Church in this Age), 1919.

It is necessary to add a word here about Söderblom's relation to the Swedish school of idealistic philosophy, connected with the name of Boström, which held an important place at Uppsala in the 19th century. It is clear that his two friends, Göransson and Fries, both united their Ritschlianism with this idealism. The conjunction may seem strange, in view of the Ritschlian theology's avowed independence of all metaphysics. In reality, however, Ritschl himself had been far more deeply indebted to the idealistic philosophy than he himself ever understood; and further, the Swedish idealism, in opposition to the older traditionalist theology, had represented in large measure the liberalising and humanising interpretation of Christianity which was typical of the 19th century. Hence the union of this idealistic metaphysic with Ritschlian theology was in fact by no means as strange as might appear at first sight.

Söderblom's attitude to the philosophy of Boström is not easy to fix; but it seems clear that he never accepted it anything like so definitely as his two friends, and in a number of places he shows an inclination to draw a sharp line between religion and metaphysics. At the same time he certainly regarded with friendliness this Swedish "philosophy of personality"; and when, in an essay of 1903 which we shall discuss later, he distinguished the non-Christian "mysticism of the Infinite" from the Christian "personal mysticism," his choice of terminology was, as he himself tells us, not unconnected with the Swedish idealism. In another place, where he is insisting on the strong individualism of the Sermon on the Mount, he says

> "The philosophy of personality, which in our own century has been the crown and the glory of Swedish civilization, comes in this respect far nearer to the teaching of Jesus than the philosophic assumptions which underlie many of the products of modern theology."

But it is probable that his philosophic connections were less directly with Boström and with the later idealism than with Eric Gustaf Geijer, for whom he had a warm regard.

Another of Söderblom's teachers, to whom he often expressed his indebtedness, was the historian Harald Hjärnes. From him he certainly learnt a critical acumen, a healthy disrespect for all authorities, and a rare universality of outlook, which were beyond question of the greatest importance for the future student of religions and universal churchman.

Looking through the long list of Söderblom's published works, one is struck by the fact that the series of short articles which head the series contains a prophecy of what was to follow. His first short articles dealt with Anskar, the first missionary to Sweden ; the evangelical movement among American students, and notes of travel in America ; Christianity and the Labour movement ; Christianity and modern thought ; a World Conference at Amsterdam ; and Ritschlian theology, besides some essays on Luther and the Reformation. These subjects all occur again in his later work. One of his latest books was a book on Anskar, published for the 1,100th anniversary in 1930, for which occasion Söderblom's energy had raised in his memory the beautiful Anskar-chapel on Björkö. It is clear also that from the beginning his attention was directed to Christian-social problems, that his outlook was already world-wide, and that he strove unceasingly to set forth Christianity in a dress intelligible to his own day. Not least characteristic is it, that his first essays in theology proper dealt with Martin Luther.

It is worth noting that by his contact with Ritschl and his theology he was brought into contact with Luther, and encouraged to study Luther ; he was in fact attracted to Ritschlianism on the side where it was strongest. The Ritschlian theologians devoted themselves heart and soul to the study of Luther ; and perhaps, when all is told, this was their greatest contribution to the progress of theology. It is true that the interpretation of Luther given by Ritschl and Harnack, and reflected also in Söderblom's earlier writings, is unduly schematized, and in many important respects untrue to Luther's real mind : that this is the case has been

fully proved by the vigorous and successful study of Luther which recent years have seen. But the criticisms which may and must now be made against the interpretations given in the late 19th century, should not be allowed to rob the Ritschlian theologians of the credit of having greatly stimulated the study of Luther; indeed, they could not have undertaken a work of more importance for the future. Seen in this light, the Ritschlian theology appears as a theology of transition. It was to a larger extent than its opponents ever guessed, a continuation of the previous stage, of the tradition derived from the Illumination of the 18th century and the Idealism of the 19th; yet it was also preparing the way for a great change. Its greatest achievement was, that by reviving the study of Luther it called into action forces which were to bring about its own dissolution.

It would not be true to say that the theological professors made no efforts at all to keep Söderblom at Uppsala; but it came to nothing, and in 1894 he went to be Chaplain to the Legation at Paris. But this did not mean that his days as a student and scholar were over; on the contrary, in spite of the zealous energy with which he devoted himself to the exacting duties of his charge, he made time for intensive work in the world of books. Paris not only brought him international and interconfessional contacts; it also put him in touch with the study of Comparative Religion, just at the time when this subject was attracting to itself a wholly new interest. He now made this his special subject, if so vast a study can be called a special subject, and he published in French two treatises on Persian religion.[1] From the theological point of view, the most significant thing was that the eschatological ideas of Persian religion had attracted his attention; and this influence is seen in his chief theological work of this period, entitled *The Sermon on the Mount and our age.*[2]

[1] *Les Fravashis*, Paris, 1899; *La vie future d'après le mazdéisme, à la lumière des croyances parallèles dans les autres religions*, Angers, 1901.

[2] *Jesu bärgspredikan och vår tid*, Stockholm, 1898.

This book is, like all its author's work, vigorously written ; problems press hard on one another, those of the Sermon itself and those of modern ethics. Naturally he has much to say on the Gospel of the Kingdom of God ; his dependence on Ritschl is in many respects particularly clear, and he repeats Ritschl's criticism of Luther, that his view of the Kingdom of God was too one-sidedly religious. But he can also criticize Ritschl's interpretation of the Kingdom.

> " No one," he writes, " can rightly deny or minimize the great service which Ritschl has rendered to the Church by his strong assertion of the idea of the Kingdom of God, and by setting it in the centre of Christianity. But Ritschl, who in so many ways opens out and develops genuinely Christian thoughts with the insight of genius, is also typically modern in violently reading his own ideas into the Scriptures . . . Jesus and the Apostles did not preach the Kingdom of God as a synonym for the ethical progress of Christianized mankind. The teaching of the Sermon cannot be understood in all its sharp and incomparable absoluteness, so long as the eschatological transcendental, incommensurable side of the Kingdom is neglected."

Söderblom's own exegesis of the idea of the Kingdom is marked by the effort to show that the eschatological view-point is not the only view-point of the Gospel, but is there united with the idea of the Kingdom as *present.*

In 1901 he returned to Uppsala as Professor of " teologiska prenotioner och teologisk encyclopedi." He entered on his office on September 24th, with an Inaugural Lecture on " The history of religions and the theology of the Church." He maintained with vigour the importance of the new study of religions for theological study in general, showing by a series of instances how, both in its earliest days and in subsequent centuries, Christianity had had a thousand contacts with the non-Christian religious world, and that a knowledge of non-Christian religions is *one* of the essential pre-requisites for a right understanding of Christianity. One of his main points was that

> " The study of the history of religions brings out in clearer light than before that which is novel and characteristic in the Gospel."

It was a notable saying. It showed two things ; first, that while his study of the world-religions had naturally for its main object just the investigation and clearer understanding of them, it had for him the further importance, in his eyes the greater importance, that it helped him to a fuller understanding of Christianity itself. When he became a student of religions, he did not cease to be a theologian ; he found no opposition, scarcely even a tension, between that study and the study of the meaning of Christianity, which is theology. And secondly, it showed that his study of other religions did not lead him to a syncretistic view of Christianity ; on the contrary, it brought out more clearly the uniqueness of Christianity.

The Inaugural Lecture had a second main theme ; it aimed at giving a statement of the relation of the study of religions and the Church. It was common at that period for both " radical " and " conservative " theologians to advocate a separation between study for the sake of knowledge, and a theology of a " practical " character, suited to the needs of the Church. Söderblom totally denied this. He refused to recognize any study of religion that was not purely objective, in the sense of being wholly dominated by the effort to understand the real nature of the object of study ; and he challenged the doctrinaire assumption that the student of religion should himself stand outside the " religious world." He assails this parody of objectivity :

> " If," he says, " the matter is envisaged in an adequately realistic way, it should be plain that a personal fellowship with and knowledge of the life of religion in the religious society is a help and not a hindrance to the student of religion. It is another matter altogether, if the student is deficient in intellectual honesty and love of truth. That is his own affair, and it is not to be blamed upon his evangelical piety or on his ministerial office in the church."

In conclusion, he expresses his conviction that a study which seeks only the truth and nothing else, must ultimately save the life of true religion :

> " Any scientific study of religion, if it be carried through with faithfulness, and if it be concerned with weighty matters, is bound to serve the cause of true religion, whether the student intends this or not, whether the student is conscious of it or not."

Perhaps no theological Inaugural Lecture in Sweden has ever made a greater impression ; and the points were pressed home in the address which he gave to students at the close of the proceedings. Again he spoke courageous and enthusiastic words about the glorious task of theology, and about the Church and the privilege of serving her. Many have testified how he gripped his hearers, filling them with a sense of freedom and exhilaration ; it seemed like a day of spring sunshine after weeks of cold and gloom. Later on, in a Pastoral Letter to his diocese, Söderblom used the phrase " helpers of your joy," from II Cor., i, 24 ; his own professorship was indeed a help to theological joy. The best of it all was, that the programme thus announced did not end in promises, but that the promises were fulfilled in an energetic activity abounding with vitality and rich in suggestive schemes. It was soon felt that a new era had dawned in the theological life at Uppsala, and that a new atmosphere was being created full of promise for theological work.

In recent years Swedish theology has entered on a period of great productivity. Progressive and intensive work has been done, and a comprehensive theological literature has come into being, reflecting, as is natural, the differing outlook of its authors, but nevertheless showing an unmistakeable homogeneity. There are certain theological ideas which more or less dominate the whole, so that, in spite of all diversities, it is possible to speak of a school of modern Swedish theology. It is also clear that this theology cannot be grouped with any of the theological parties, which were in acute controversy with one another at the turn of the

century ; and also, that it cannot at all be described as an appendage to German theology, as was so often the case with Swedish theology in the nineteenth century and earlier. It has a character of its own, and it may be said that Swedish theology has never been so independent and active as now in the twentieth century.

These remarks on modern Swedish theology are necessary, if Söderblom's own theological contribution is to be seen in its true light. It cannot be said that he stands alone as the founder of this Swedish theology ; but his theological work has been of fundamental importance to it. It is not only that it owes to him certain characteristic theological ideas ; these we shall pass to consider in a moment, for his work was highly stimulating. His influence is also seen in the type of theology which now came to be done, in an attitude which was anti-doctrinaire, and, in the best sense, free from prejudice, and in a sureness of touch in recognizing that which is genuinely religious ; for the true freedom from prejudice in theological work is the art of recognizing that which is genuine, wherever it is found and under whatever form it appears. But unfortunately, much or most of what is called freedom from prejudice consists simply in the exchange of one dogmatism for another, a positive dogmatism for a negative. From the one form of dogmatism as from the other, Söderblom was utterly free. He did not judge merely by forms and formulae, as all dogmatism does; he had the power of penetrating through the forms to the root of the matter. His work was both courageous and creative of courageousness.

Finally, Söderblom's typical synthesis of national and international helped to strengthen the independence and self-consciousness of Swedish theology. Previously, the foreign relations of Swedish theology had been in one direction only ; but Söderblom's foreign connections were more universal than those of any Swedish theologian before him. But that did not make him cosmopolitan, like a plant without roots ; his work was very typically Swedish, rooted in Swedish national life and in the Swedish Church

Perhaps indeed he was only able to accept foreign influence as freely as he did, because he was so firmly and deeply rooted in his home soil. His attitude in general, as well as his later ecumenical work, is well illustrated by a passage from his book on *The Problem of Religion in Catholicism and Protestantism :*

> " When I look out over Christendom, regarding it in the light of its history, I can say, while retaining a wide-awake and critical eye for the weak condition of our Church, her lack of spiritual power, and her failure to live up to her own principles, that Lutheranism, which according to my judgment is the richest of all evangelical expressions of Christianity, is nowhere else embodied in a church with such a history and such a broad-minded continuity as the Church of Sweden. I do not wish to speak like a wiseacre in a club ; but I would remark, that if a central point is required for the development of a strong consciousness of an evangelical catholicity (allmännelighet) between the churches, no church stands in so favourable a position as our Swedish Church. Let us then be neither sleepy, nor yet rash in undertaking I know not what convulsive efforts in pitiful ignorance of our true aim, but wake up to conscious realization of the treasures committed to us and the task awaiting us."[1]

It would be possible to group Söderblom's theological works, during his period as Professor and as Archbishop, under five heads, apart from productions incidental to his professorial subject, which are not being directly considered in this essay. These five headings are : (1) the question of Prophetic Religion and Revelation ; (2) the idea of the Church ; (3) the study of Luther ; (4) the work of Christ and the Cross ; and (5) the ecumenical problem. We will take these in order.

[1] *Religionsproblemet inom katolicism och protestantism*, Stockholm, 1910, p. 498. This book includes essays dealing in some detail with J. H. Newman, G. Tyrrell and F. von Hügel; the last of these especially exercised considerable influence on Söderblom's views on mysticism, which we shall discuss later.

(1) Possibly the most remarkable book that Söderblom ever wrote was the little book on *The Religion of Revelation*, or Prophetic Religion, which first appeared in 1903.[1] It would be no exaggeration to call this essay of 1903 a pioneer work, and to describe it as Söderblom's declaration of theological independence, in which he applied to the interpretation of Christianity the fruits of his work on the History of Religions.

When, in the early years of this century, the *religionsgeschichtlich* school began to show a vigorous activity, its representatives frequently criticized with violence, and even with a certain arrogance, the interpretation of primitive Christianity given by the exegesis of the day, assailing not only the traditional teaching, but also the Ritschlian exegesis, then accepted as "modern." While recognizing their merits, the new school accused the Ritschlians of working with doctrinaire assumptions, and giving a modernizing version of primitive Christianity, while leaving out of account such elements as could not be harmonized with their own view. It cannot now be denied that the *religionsgeschichtlich* school, whatever faults they may have been guilty of later, really had a fresh outlook to bring, and were able to clear the ground in a healthy way. The great gain was, that men's eyes were now opened to perceive essential aspects of primitive Christianity which had been hidden both from the traditionalists and from the Ritschlians.

It is interesting to consider Söderblom's *Uppenbarelsereligion* from this point of view; for it is clear that he too had been led by his studies in the History of Religions to share the new outlook, and thus to be able to criticize not merely the traditionalist view, but also the Ritschlian school to which he had first attached himself. Four points call for attention.

First, he insists on the principle that religious facts must be religiously judged. Neither culture nor morals can rightly

[1] *Uppenbarelsereligion*, published in 1903 in a volume of essays written for the 90th birthday of Professor Torén; published separately in 1930, together with two other essays of his own, under the above title.

be set in the seat of judgment, and religion compelled to justify itself before them and be subject to their verdict. There is indeed, he says, one main type of religion, in which the religious development runs parallel with the cultural; this type he calls "culture-religion" or "nature-religion," and it is found on a line leading from polytheism to pantheism or universal idealism. But there is also another and a higher type, the prophetic type of religion, which is anticipated in Persian religion, but is found fully developed in the religion of the Bible. This he calls *Upperbarelsereligion*, the religion of revelation. In this type the true relation of religion to culture is fully clear; religion is an independent thing, which is by no means tied to the changes of civilization, and may as well be found in opposition to a high and rich culture as associated with it. The essential point in the "religion of revelation" is that its faith "is directed towards the one, living, spiritual God, who is active in history and is revealed there." But morals cannot any more than culture be taken as the standard by which religion is to be judged; religion must be judged as religion. The development of this thesis is directly in opposition to the ethical valuation of religion, characteristic of Ritschlianism. The same point was further developed by him in his dictionary-articles on "Holiness"[1] and elsewhere. Söderblom expressed with great vigour the thesis that the idea of the holy is the essential element of religion, long before Rudolf Otto, in his book *Das Heilige*, in 1917, drew attention in Germany to the religious significance of the idea of holiness.

Secondly, he emphasizes strongly the importance of the eschatological outlook in the prophetic type of religion. His investigations in the Parsi eschatology, to which we have already alluded, showed him the way here. He compared, from this point of view, the teaching of Zarathustra and the Biblical data, and contrasts both these with the "nature-" or "culture-religions." In thus emphasizing the importance of eschatology in the study of the Bible, he

[1] Article on "Holiness," and other articles, in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1913.

fixed on a point which contemporary exegesis had seriously neglected, but which subsequent work has brought into great prominence.

Thirdly, he emphasizes the importance and the religious value of the Christian form of dualism, and its essential difference from the " metaphysical " dualism of matter and spirit, which is characteristic of the " nature-religions." The previous phase of theology had found the dualistic element in Christianity a stumbling-block, and pointing to its connection with Persian religion, had often sought to find its origin there ; the historical connection was taken as an indication that this dualism in Christianity was only a secondary and relatively unessential element. In actual fact, the question of historical origins was coupled in a question-begging way with that of the real value of the dualistic element in Christianity, and these theologians were under-emphasizing the dualistic idea because their own outlook was monistic and evolutionary.

Söderblom too asserts a connection between Persian and Biblical religion, while refusing to commit himself on the question of origins. But it is wholly alien to his mind to confuse the historical question of origins with that of the actual importance of dualism in Christianity ; and on this latter point he is quite clear.

> " For a century," he writes, " it has been treated as self-evident that the dualism of late Judaism and of Christianity is derived from Persian religion. This is not the place to investigate that point. It is sufficient for our present purpose that the Jewish and Christian dualism is of the same nature as that of Persian religion ; it is the opposition between God and the devil ; the Divine will of triumphing love, and radical, inexplicable evil ; life and death ; faith and despair ; heaven and hell ; the conflict, in which we stand in this world between good and evil (Eph., vi, 11 ff.) and not the metaphysical dualism between spirit and matter, the one and the many, absolute being and the world. Is the belief in the devil, which the Gospel shares with the contemporaries of

> Jesus, a dark stain from a dark age on the bright picture of the message of salvation ? It is held that the dualism of the Gospel may and should be discarded as an element of alien origin, and in its nature strange and discordant ; but I cannot see otherwise, than that the deeper experience of sin, suffering and need which is a religion's strength, led necessarily from the monism of the Prophets to the dualism of the Gospel, and that this development is one of the most significant in the history of the religion of revelation. Signs that this point is being perceived are not lacking in modern theology. Jesus did not soften down the dualism ; he accentuated it. No one has ever penetrated deeper into the mystery of evil than his words ' An enemy hath done this.' In his teaching there is no theodicy, no apologia for God in the mysterious conflict with need and sin, such as is offered by Job's friends, and such as apologetic in every age makes well-meaning efforts to provide. All attempts made by Christians either to escape from dualism or to overcome it have weakened the power which lies in the unafraid realism of the Gospel, or has led to the impossible solution of making evil part of God's nature."

It must however, be said that the "signs that this point is being perceived" were in fact, at the time when the essay was written, remarkably weak.

Fourthly, there is a point to which we have already alluded, the point which attracted most attention and comment when *Uppenbarelsereligion* first appeared : Söderblom's distinction between " the mysticism of the infinite " and " the mysticism of personality." This distinction corresponds to the main distinction round which the essay revolves, between nature-religion and the religion of revelation. The idea behind this distinction is evidently a criticism of the Ritschlian theology ; we have already noted his assertion that " mysticism and spirituality had been crowded out." He saw that the justifiable assault which the Ritschlians made on mysticism had involved an opposition also to much that had a necessary place in the Christian

life of faith. But it is another question, whether the term " mysticism of personality " was really fit to express his meaning. That the term " mysticism of the infinite " adequately describes the typical form of mysticism cannot be doubted. If there is now a disposition among theologians to keep the name " mysticism " for this religious type, it is because that which Söderblom means to describe by " mysticism of personality " is simply the inward and spiritual aspect of faith itself, faith in its relation of active fellowship with God ; but then, it is both superfluous and misleading to use for this the name of mysticism. It follows that to depart in this respect from Söderblom's terminology would not be to criticize his intention, but rather to express that intention more clearly.

We may note here, that Söderblom returned several times in his later work to the question of the different sorts of mysticism. Usually now he adopts a different form of words, contrasting the " mysticism of training" or "of practice" with the pure religion of grace, of which Martin Luther is the foremost representative.[1] When he still wishes to speak of this latter as a form of mysticism he can call it " the mysticism of trust " or " of forgiveness." A precisely similar criticism might be made of this terminology as we made above.

As our account has shown, Söderblom was striking out a new line in his essay on the Religion of Revelation ; and his points had the freshness and immediacy of new discoveries. More than one of his ideas directly traversed the beliefs then deemed fashionable ; but this only increased the importance of his teaching work in the years that followed. The essay was intended primarily as a contribution to the Babel-Bible controversy then going on, rather than as a formal criticism of an accepted theological position ; for while it contains comments of a polemical nature, no great emphasis is laid on them. Yet it was such a criticism, and it was a book that belonged to the future more than to the

[1] This contrast comes in *Tre livsformer*, 1922, and *Waldemar Rudins inre liv*, 1923.

present. Söderblom's intuitive genius had even at this early stage seized hold of ideas which were lying in men's minds, waiting to be drawn out. His training in the History of Religions was an invaluable help. But his treatment compares favourably with the usual work of the *religionsgeschichtlich* school, both of that and of a later period; he never fell into a syncretistic interpretation of Christianity, and he understood, as few of that school understood, how to express religiously and correctly features which might seem to be "primitive" and barbarous. We have noted already what he had to say about the dualistic element in Christianity.

In later years he returned frequently to the subject of Revelation. In a lecture given in 1911[1] he speaks of revelation as progressive; God's revelation cannot rightly be treated as static. Certainly,

> "according to the Christian belief, the Divine self-communication stands as valid for all times, and inexhaustible in meaning, in the Biblical history, particularly in the person of Christ";

but it is

> "impossible to maintain faith in God's revelation without extending it beyond the Biblical period."

God's revelation continues as a creative power and a saving will, and it is seen most clearly

> "in nature, in history, and in the moral life; more accurately, (1) in genius as a part of nature, (2) in the order and trend of history, and (3) in the regeneration and building up of the character of the individual."

It is right, perhaps, to say that these ideas are not expressed with full clearness, and that the three points given cannot be thus distinguished; in particular, that "genius as a part of nature" ought not to be put side by side with the regenerating and sanctifying power of Divine grace. Above all, it is to be doubted whether the idea of Christian revelation is here maintained in its purity, and

[1] *Ett bidrag till den kristna uppenbarelsetrons tolkning* (A contribution to the interpretation of the Christian faith in revelation), 1911.

whether it is not made partly synonymous with an idealizing of human nature as such, which is really dependent on Idealism. So again, the somewhat obscure statements about progressive revelation which occur in the last chapter of *Religionsproblemet inom katolicism och protestantism*, with a clear reference to Bergson's philosophy, certainly involve ideas which obscure rather than elucidate the idea of the Christian faith, which Söderblom has in mind. He writes, for instance

> " The Hellenist Tegnér is not Hellenic, but at once Christian and modern, when he thus sings of ' the eternal ' :
>
> And the will, that was pent in a smouldering breast
> Takes manhood, like God, and gets doing,
> The Right gets a sword, and the Truth gains a voice,
> And the nations rise up to renewing."

It must, however, be said that the idea which Tegnér here expresses cannot rightly be labelled as Scriptural or Christian.

But even if objection may rightly be taken to some of Söderblom's sayings about progressive revelation, dating from round about 1910, nevertheless it must be maintained both that the idea of progressive revelation which he so energetically asserted is in itself an element in the Christian faith which had been unduly neglected, and that his main purpose was to exhibit the God of Christian faith as the living God, who is ever active. Hence he lays great stress on the domination of human lives by the Holy Spirit, and he gives this definition of a Saint :

> " The Saints are they who by their life, their character, and their acts, prove clearly and beyond doubt that there is a living God."

It should also be added that Söderblom himself regarded all his published work on the subject of Revelation as preparatory sketches ; the subject would not let him go, and he continued to work at it. He told me once that he intended to publish his Gifford Lectures, of which only the first series were actually finished, under the title of

The living God. In these lectures he probably succeeded in expressing more clearly and firmly lines of thought which previously had been uncertain and incomplete.

(2) We pass now to consider his view of the Church. This subject is closely related to the last. In all the copious literature on the Church, which came out in Sweden in the early years of this century, the background of the idea of the Church is that of progressive revelation ; the Church is the expression of God's continuing activity in the world of men. Thus Söderblom wrote in 1911 :

> " God's revelation is always going on ; so far we agree with the Catholic view. But an important difference comes in here. Romanism says : God's continuing revelation creates an institution, which has its apex in the Pope. We say : God's continuing revelation is history ; but the Church is God's work and God's instrument. The religious significance of the Church is sometimes over-estimated, but also often under-estimated. God has entrusted to the Church the Divine privilege and the thrilling duty of proclaiming and giving to the world God's grace, by word and by deed and by sacrament. Our faith in God's continuing revelation in history is now moving us to recognize with greater conscientiousness and reverence than of old the value of men, of means, and of ordinances, which God's providence has bestowed on our churches in the course of history. The Church needs to open her eyes more than she does, to see how God is constantly revealing Himself."

Söderblom's first book on the Church came out in 1908, with the title *The Church of Sweden.*[1] Einar Billing exactly described this book as " discourses on the Church addressed to the educated among her detractors." That Söderblom had always had a sense of the Church and its importance, is evident from the Inaugural Lecture of 1901, in which he said,

[1] *Sveriges kyrka,* Stockholm, 1908.

> " It is only as creative of a fellowship, and as a Church, that religion reveals important sides of its nature."

Now, in 1908, he is pleading with enthusiasm the cause of the Swedish Church, unfolding her hidden riches before her educated detractors. He has a living assurance that her day has not yet passed. The book ends with brave and hopeful words :

> " Is it my faith that makes me to hear wrongly ? No, I hear aright ; and from many sides I hear voices, which tell me that the bells will ring yet again for service in the Swedish Church."

When this book was published in 1908, the idea of the Church was on the way to regain a new actuality, unguessed before. Soon people were talking not without reason, of a Church movement. As we have said, much began to be written about the Church ; different ideas were set out, but all closely related to one another. If we ask what was Söderblom's own contribution to this movement, two points suggest themselves. The first was his strong realism. In the book already mentioned, and his book of 1915 on *The Body and Soul of the Swedish Church*,[1] the Church is presented not as an abstract idea existing somewhere up in the air, but as a reality in the world of history, having a body as well as a soul. The " body," the organization, is neither to be despised nor over-valued. It is not a sacrosanct and immutable Divine institution, but it is essential to the Church's proper work, for the Gospel's sake. The aim is

> " to bring God's revelation home to human souls ; and in so far as this is attained, the organization justifies itself."

Söderblom praises the form of organization of the Swedish Church for its convenience, or its power to give free scope to personality, and to counteract the ever-present tendency to the formation of cliques. He also uses ideas which were

[1] *Svenska kyrkans kropp och själ,* a collection of essays on the Church, named after the first essay. This was published in English in the *Constructive Quarterly*, in two parts, Vol. III, pp. 281-310, and 506-545, with the titles, " On the character of the Swedish Church," and " On the soul of the Church of Sweden."

specially proclaimed and put into practice by Einar Billing, that the great strength of the organization lies in the fact that its universal scope is the expression of the universality of God's grace. Again, he constantly gives concrete illustrations of the importance of the Swedish Church to Swedish civilization and culture ; but it would be a complete misunderstanding of his idea of the Church to infer that this point of view was for him primary. As has often been pointed out, his cultural interests were strong and wide-embracing, and he took a great part in mediating the influence of the Church on national life ; but this is not to say that he regarded the Church principally from this point of view. With tireless energy he insisted again and again, that in regard to the Church's work the central emphasis must lie on the purely religious side ; we may note that this insistence is directly connected with his general principle enunciated in regard to the History of Religion, that religious facts must be religiously judged.

> " I have tried to show," he wrote in an article, " certain sides of the church's significance which are commonly neglected. So much the more important is it to end by stressing once again the central point. The Church's object is to reach men with the glad tidings. All else that the Church is and does, has value only as means to this one object."

But besides the realism—we may call it religious realism —which marks Söderblom's view of the Church, we must also observe the universality of outlook, which was typical of him from the beginning in so remarkable a degree, and which, more than anything else, forms his own special contribution. During the nineteenth century, Swedish church life was strangely isolated, more so than it had often been in earlier centuries. It was a little world by itself ; and the breaking-down of the isolation, and the widening of the outlook of Swedish Churchmen from the local and national to the universal, is due to none so much as to Söderblom himself. His later ecumenical work was in many respects anticipated in his early writings. It was not

merely that he was interested in studying other Churches and making contacts with them—a point which may be illustrated from several of the essays in *The Body and Soul of the Swedish Church*, and from *The Problem of Religion in Catholicism and Protestantism*—but still more that his idea of the Church itself was free from all merely national and particularist limitations. The Swedish Church was not a Swedish national institution only; it was above all a branch of the one, holy catholic Church of Christ. But this universal outlook did not at all mean an under-valuing of its own special characteristics.

> " Since," he wrote, " the ideal of one all-dominating Church institution—a proud ideal, but not without its dangers for the purity of religion—disappeared for ever, the universality of Christendom is realized through the different Churches regarding themselves as co-operating in mutual understanding or competition. The sense of the whole is strengthened in proportion as the tasks which lie before each Church are fearlessly carried out. If a new *corpus evangelicorum* is to come into being, not as a political creation, but as a catholic mind free from sectarian self-sufficiency, this cannot be through a process of fusion, or an ignoring of the diversities which really exist. What we need for a real catholicity is a clear sense of the treasures committed to our own church. Faithfulness to our own inheritance must be united with respect for the ideals of others."

The thorough universality of Söderblom's idea of the Church is of fundamental importance. A lecture in German on " Why I am a Lutheran " begins as follows :

> " I am a member of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. The Church of God exists in most countries, and it exists in Sweden."

His universal outlook is reflected also in his choice of terminology. In the same lecture he says :

> " We too use the expression ' the Church of Sweden.' But properly we ought to say, ' the Church in Sweden '."

It is equally typical that he loves to speak of Evangelical

Christendom as " the evangelical-catholic part of Christ's Church." The splendid title of " Catholic," universal, must not be usurped by non-evangelical Christendom.

But this universal outlook is not merely coupled with the " faithfulness to our own inheritance," of which we have just heard, but has its root in that faithfulness. The Lutheran idea is far from being incompatible with a universal outlook ; on the contrary, universality of view is a direct result of the deep insight into the central essence of Christianity, which the Lutheran idea gives. Söderblom repeatedly insists on this. His main answer to the question *Warum ich Lutheraner bin* is as follows :

> " If I were to try to give a definite answer to this question, I should say in the first place and in the last that I have to thank my part of the Church for the overwhelming experience of the greatness of God's free grace, which offers to the troubled human heart forgiveness and peace and saves man from perdition, not through our own human efforts and religious observance, but through faith in Jesus Christ and in the mystery of his vicarious Passion."

In the sequel he seeks to draw some conclusions from this religious principle of Lutheranism, showing how genuine Lutheranism has the gift of including and embracing things which in some other confessions are one-sidedly emphasized or set in opposition, such as the pulpit and the altar, or tradition and freedom.

(3) There are few of Söderblom's writings which do not somehow or other touch on *Luther*, or rather, put him in a central place. Thus, in *Uppenbarelsereligion* Luther is taken as the type of the " mysticism of personality." In the same essay he criticizes in passing the interpretation of Luther in Ritschl and Harnack, who take Luther's *terrores conscientiae* and his experience of " death and hell " to be conditioned by his own personal condition and the ignorance of salvation in which the mediaeval church had kept him. But this, Söderblom says, will not do ; the explanation is too shallow. It might be said that this observation forms the basis of his

big book on *Humour and Melancholy and other studies in Luther*[1]; for its central problem is just the meaning of Luther's terrors of conscience. It appeared at a time when the study of Luther was attracting much attention, and the interpretation of his theology was undergoing a well-nigh revolutionary change. Söderblom did not engage directly in the theological discussion; *Humour and Melancholy* was primarily a psychological study, with an intuitive understanding of its subject-matter, and a wealth of acute and pertinent observations. As such it stands by itself. In general, this book is in full accord with the new view of Luther, in so far as its interpretation of Luther's "melancholy" cuts the idea of guilt free from the moralistic setting in which it had generally been placed by the theology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But it could scarcely be said that Söderblom fully drew the theological consequences of the altered meaning of guilt.

No one, perhaps, in our day has done more to spread knowledge about Luther outside the limits of Lutheranism. Söderblom spoke and wrote constantly about Luther, in several languages. He found to his grief that in other confessions knowledge of Luther was as a rule extremely poor; as he once remarked, it was as though Luther were only a figure of the third magnitude, and not Christendom's greatest religious genius. In this work of making Luther to be known and his importance rightly understood, Söderblom's presence at the great Conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne, and in the ecumenical movement generally, carried great weight. It was primarily through him that Lutheranism came to take a place in inter-church life, which it had not taken before.

In this connection it must be emphasized that Söderblom had a far clearer perception of Luther's universal significance than most earlier students of Luther. In a lecture given in 1920 on "The issue of Mysticism in Martin Luther's trust in God,"[2] he says that a common fault in the study of Luther has been

[1] *Humor och melankoli och andra Lutherstudier*, Stockholm, 1919.
[2] Printed in *Tre livsformer* (Three forms of life), 1922.

> " to separate him abruptly from the preceding stage of Church history " ;

and this has been done by both sides.

> " In the evangelical camp, Luther has been treated as the herald of the Old Gospel, after a long parenthesis of error and darkness." " In the Roman camp the contrast between the preceding period and the great apostasy has been made if possible even more abrupt." " As against such failure to see the organic connection of Luther and the Church, a failure which has been increased and not diminished by the Ritschlian school on the one side, and Father Denifle's learned lampoon on the other, it has seemed to me essential, ever since I first wrestled with the problem, to find and hold fast to the real continuity."

Söderblom therefore vigorously maintains in this lecture the primary thesis, that the student of Luther must see Luther in a universal perspective. His contribution to the fulfilment of this programme, here and elsewhere, is as a rule to follow out the connections of Luther with medieval mysticism. But in reality the programme has wider bearings ; in particular, it is necessary for the continuity to be exhibited which Luther shows in many important respects with patristic theology. It is only when this is done that the universality of Luther can receive full justice. For Söderblom himself, his zealous efforts in the study of Luther brought this consequence, that Luther's view of Christianity came to stand out more and more for him as the typical form of " classic Christianity." This conviction, which received its great monument in his exposition of Luther's *Lesser Catechism,*[1] stood in line with the movement of his thought, which became more and more pronounced as the years went by, towards that which is plainly and simply Christian.

(4) This leads us directly to our next point ; with increasing intensity, from 1914 onwards, Söderblom's theology came to centre round *the Cross.*

[1] *Martin Luthers lilla katekes, belyst,* 1929.

His view of Christianity had indeed always been thoroughly Christocentric. In his Inaugural Lecture of 1901 he had criticized Harnack's answer to the question " What is Christianity ? " :

> " A survey along the lines of Comparative Religion puts it in my judgment beyond all doubt, that Harnack, in spite of all his assertion of the Gospel as the perfect religion and of the eternal significance of Jesus as the Way to the Father, sees wrongly in this matter (*i.e.*, the part of Jesus in the disciples' relation to God). Jesus actually claimed and ascribed to himself a place as mediator in the disciples' relation to God, which has never been claimed by any other."

In his book *The Church of Sweden* he said :

> " Modern theology has not done its duty till it has set forth Christ more truly, deeply, rightly, with a more central place for Christ the Saviour, and more faithfulness to his spirit, than the theology of previous ages."

So too, he emphasized early the meaning of suffering. In *Uppenbarelsereligion* he took the different religions' attitude to suffering as decisive for the determination of their real inner power :

> " The power of a religion is not to be measured by its hymns of praise, but by its experience of the misery and darkness of life. Only one religion has gone as deep down into hell as the Indian, that religion of the world's pain, and deeper still. That religion is Christianity. But in the former the message of salvation is in the end pessimistic ; the true life is the stillness of death. In the latter it is in the end optimistic, in spite of all hells, an eternal Yea against every Nay."

Hence it was not really a new beginning, when Söderblom's thoughts, during the awful period of the Great War and after it, began to centre unceasingly, in preaching as in theological writing, round the Passion and the Cross. But there was beyond all doubt, a change of accent. In two documents dating from 1919, *The Way of Christ's Church*

in our age, a message both old and new, and *Are we approaching a revival of religion?*[1] the Cross is the dominating theme.

In the former of these he teaches that suffering is not strange to God himself; God "takes a share in our suffering." He shrinks back from the thought, but it forces itself on him as inevitable.

> "The truth about the strange ways of God has been expressed in forms which do not satisfy. Is God himself involved in conflict, suffering and pain? This idea shows us now, as in the old Gnostic systems and in all forms in which it appears, how inadequate our thought is to comprehend God's nature, beyond the testimony of revelation, that is, above all that of Christ and Christian experience. But, to my mind, such a blind groping after an idea of God as himself involved in the suffering and conflict of history, does more to meet the strange and tragic conditions of our life than a view which arranges God and the world's course in a patent harmonious scheme, in which all goes as right as can be from start to finish. It may be a pity that we were not there to arrange how the world should run. But in the real world, God's way goes through suffering; therefore the way of his Church must be the same. The idea that through suffering may come salvation and atonement has been guessed at by man for thousands of years, and expressed in passion-rites, till at last the passion became something more than a ritual; till the Man of Sorrows came, he who was also God's holy one, the Lord of Joy and of triumphant trust. In any case our Christian faith makes suffering a part of God's nature, if we really take seriously our faith that God is revealed in Christ's love and purity."

It hardly needs to be said, that he has here no thought of limiting the sovereignty of God, and that his language about the suffering of the Divine love has nothing to do with the wild speculations of ancient Gnosticism. What he means

[1] *Kristi församlings väg i denna tid, ny gammal förkunnelse* and *Gå vi mot religionens förnyelse?* Stockholm, 1919.

is what he says: to take seriously the faith that God is revealed in Christ, and that the climax of the revelation is the Cross. He means to cast aside the idea that Christianity may be presented as a rational explanation of the universe, with an answer ready for every possible question; and he means to bring us to face the mystery of suffering love. He writes as a motto to a German publication: "Zentrum meiner Theologie ist das Geheimnis des stellvertretenden Leidens Christi."

To the question "Are we approaching a revival of religion?" his answer is an unreserved confession of the Cross as the expression of what Christianity really is. The importance of his utterances in this little book is shown by the fact that he repeats them continually in the later years; and none can doubt that there is something here, which became more and more for him the centre of all.

> "For me," he writes, "all else is summed up in the great problem of atonement and restoration. Do we note God's scandalous yet alone fruitful way through the hideous confusion of the world? Not to one side of, nor across in front of, but into and through the midst of the tragedy of life. I know not whether we Christians, whether the Christian Churches are worthy, whether there is in us the power of the Spirit, or whether it shall be accomplished by the instrumentality of others. But one thing I know. The only religion that is now of any account, the only faith which now can satisfy the deep, hungering souls of all languages and nations, is a new and irresistible preaching of the Cross, a fresh and convincing experience of the mystery of salvation, which is revealed in the self-offering of the Saviour in life and death. I am not pleading for any blasphemous theory of a change in God's nature, nor for any pagan notion of sacrifice; but only for that which is the inmost essence of Christianity, which since Paul's day has been a stumbling-block to religious and irreligious rationalists. . . . Let me only say, that one dogma is for me of greater weight than all the rest. He who stands in the presence

of this dogma, and knows not what it means, may be as zealous as possible for the letter of Scripture, for dogmas and traditional teachings; it is all of little use, if in any degree he obscures the real essence of Christianity, which is the Mystery of the Cross, to me and to numberless Christians our highest, nay our only hope in life and death. . . . To weaken down and cleverly to explain away the central mystery of Christianity and of salvation, is of no use in these hard times. The experience of the power of the Cross and of suffering to reconcile and restore, till lately regarded as old-fashioned and objectionable, has become the most palpable and necessary of the truths of religion, nay, the truth itself—in whatever forms it be expressed. . . . A well-meaning cultivated idealism cannot help mankind, any more than culture can help them. . . . No intellectualism, ancient or modern, can take the place of the infinite drama of Christianity, which runs through all history, of the individual as of the race, and gives to its meaning. It finds its centre at Calvary; and it is continued in every generation in the mysterious moral solidarity, which for woe or for blessing unites mankind in invisible bonds. In our Christian fellowship there is continually being repeated something of the mystery of the Cross, when another suffers for my sin, and by his love for me manifests something of God's power. This drama must in its degree be continued in every poor human soul. This, only this, is Christianity."

All that Söderblom had to say about the mystery of the Cross was collected by him in the book published three years before his death, *The Story of the Passion of Christ.*[1] This book is in the fullest sense written *con amore.* It is not a book of the type that is written in order that something might be written on the subject; every page testifies that it expresses something that lies near to its author's heart. It is a remarkable book in many respects; it is full from end to end of his many-sided knowledge, and gives glimpses out on every side of the world of religion; and yet it is in

[1] *Kristi pinas historia,* Stockholm, 1928.

the true sense a book of devotion, which with depth and classical simplicity speaks of the inmost meaning of Christianity, illuminating it from various sides, yet with all this showing it simply as a mystery. Among the many passion-books of Christendom this is in its way unique. Never before, perhaps, has Christendom possessed a passion-book of such wide range, yet in the essential things so simple.

(5) Söderblom's *ecumenical work* gave occasion to an immense number of writings, in several languages, ranging from short articles to his 1000-page volume describing the Stockholm Conference.[1] I must, however, confine my remarks to the theological basis which underlay his ecumenical activity. There was of course much else. The primary motive was the purely religious motive ; for in his eyes, his ecumenical work was not a task that might be taken up or left aside at pleasure, but a duty laid upon him. There was the state of Europe, with its strain and difficulty. There was the opportunity that arose out of his extraordinary power of attracting men and overcoming personal obstacles. But when all this has been said, it remains true that the great achievement of his ecumenical work cannot be understood apart from his theology. If Söderblom had not been the theologian that he was, he could never have accomplished the epoch-making ecumenical work that he did.

We are already in possession of the main points : first, the universality of his outlook, and second, the increasing concentration of his mind on the simplest and the central things of the Christian faith. The second was not less important than the first ; in the last resort it was the one thing that really mattered.

Söderblom's programme, summed up in the words " Life and Work," aimed at uniting the divided sections of Christendom, irrespective of the diversities of formulated belief and church organization, in the fellowship of a Christian brotherly love. This programme has sometimes been misunderstood ; it has been inferred that the fellowship

[1] *Kristenhetens möte i Stockholm*, Stockholm, 1926.

of Christian faith was thereby relegated to a secondary place. But this is at once disproved by the character of the Stockholm Conference ; not only because the main problem of discussion was the essentially theological problem of the Kingdom of God, but also because the fellowship which was there realized was essentially a fellowship in Christian faith. The Conference might equally well be described as a Conference for Faith and Work.

Söderblom's whole ecumenical activity can never be rightly understood till it is fully grasped that its background is not a *religionsgeschichtlich* relativism, but, on the contrary, just that concentration on the central and essential verities of the Christian faith, which has been constantly meeting us as the dominating motive of Söderblom's later years. Of this he himself was clearly conscious. As early as 1915, in *The Body and Soul of the Swedish Church*, he wrote :

> " The history of religion shows two possible ways to universality. It can be sought and gained by a broadmindedness of view, which spreads far afield its desire for knowledge, and seeks to do justice to every side and include that which is of value, wherever it is to be found. Such an enlightened eclecticism has doubtless its place. But there is also another way ; universality as such may not appear in the programme, but it emerges as a result of an outlook which does not stop at any external features, important though they may be, but penetrates to that which is essential. Luther's work belonged definitely to this latter type ; particularly in his discussion with Erasmus he showed an inflexible obstinacy, which was offensive to an eclectic broadmindedness, in holding to the principle of salvation, such as he needed for his own certainty and peace of mind. True universality is attained more surely by gripping and holding fast to that which is essential, than by seeking to embrace the diversity of the manifold."

It is true that Söderblom possessed in a high degree the power to understand and do justice to the existing diversities of religious life ; nevertheless his ecumenical work was

utterly free from eclecticism and syncretism. Unity in his eyes was not to be gained by the inclusion of diversities, but by holding fast to the essential things. It is indeed no accident that he refers to Luther in the passage just quoted. His ecumenical activity never involved anything like a neglect of Luther; at Lausanne in 1927 he stood as the recognized leader of "Lutheranism." His faithfulness to his own inheritance stood in no sort of opposition to his ecumenical mind, just because he regarded Luther's greatness as consisting above all in his deep insight into the simple essentials of the Christian faith.

We have given an outline sketch of the theological part of Söderblom's extraordinarily rich and many-sided writing on the subject of religion; but the essential features stand out clearly. The five headings which we have taken—if we leave on one side the ecumenical work, which has rather the character of "applied theology"—reflect the true order of his development as a theologian.

This development shows a clear inner continuity. The first impression gained from a survey of his theological production might well be its amazing variety; he is interested in and he discusses a bewildering diversity of subjects. No one can fail to note his lively impulsiveness and his almost incredible vivacity; he is always engaged on some voyage of discovery, always throwing out fresh suggestions, and making new and surprising combinations. An impressionist picture is readily drawn; the artistic temperament is easily recognizable. Yet besides the lively impulsiveness, he exhibits in at least as great a degree the opposite quality of dogged perseverance. For this reason there is an inner continuity in this great volume of work, miscellaneous though it may seem, and kaleidoscopic though its changes often appear. It is borne onward by the energy of a mind which never lets go; and it groups itself round certain definite points, which are found on analysis to be directly related to its centre. A thread of scarlet runs through the whole; as the years go by, his theology is seen to be growing in clearness, fixity and concentration.

We may fittingly conclude with a few words on Söderblom's place in the development of theology. The popular view would seem to be, that he was one of the pioneers in Sweden of " modern " theology ; by some it would be added, whether by way of approval or of disapproval, that this " modernism " came gradually to be modified. Those who are not in touch with theological work proper are accustomed, at least in Sweden, to divide theological work into " conservative " and " modern," the latter being supposed to have begun to come in about the end of the last century. The existence of this popular idea, in so far as it is not mere ignorance and nothing more, is to be explained by the fact that in the nineteenth century Swedish theology was mainly traditionalistic. But such a view is wholly inadequate to explain either the actual modern situation, or Söderblom's own theological position.

The Ritschlian theology, to which Söderblom first attached himself, was not of course a " modernistic " new beginning in theological history ; on the contrary, it stood in relation to a development of theological thought which reaches back through the whole nineteenth century to the Illumination of the eighteenth. It may fairly be called the last heir of a long theological tradition, whose character may be termed *idealistic* and *humanizing*. We have touched on this point already, and we have seen that in calling out new forces through its study of Luther Ritschlianism was preparing the way for a theological revolution, and was therefore a theology of transition. This theological tradition, dating from the Illumination, was during the whole period in conflict with another tradition of a more scholastic type, which had received its fixed form in the Protestant Orthodoxy of the seventeenth century. The theological history of the nineteenth century consists of the conflict between these two types.

There can be no point in minimizing the importance of Ritschlianism in Söderblom's theological education. He always freely admitted this, and gladly acknowledged his indebtedness to its leaders ; and traces of Ritschlian

influence are to be found even in his later work, sometimes in utterances which are not fully in harmony with the rest. Nevertheless it would be a complete blunder to class him as a Ritschlian. Two features show how definitely he was striking out a new line : first, the outlook which he owed to his studies in the History of Religions, which set him free from doctrinaire assumptions in his view of primitive Christianity and of the nature of the Christian faith itself ; and second, his movement in the direction of the simple essentials of the Christian faith, to which we have repeatedly drawn attention. These two factors work together in Söderblom in a remarkable way ; it is their double influence that makes the importance of his theological work and gives it a universal significance, which was greatly increased through the wide range of his ecumenical activity.

If the essential achievement of the theology of the last twenty years lies in its effort to pass beyond a statement of the theological problem which had been taken for granted for centuries, and was characterized by the conflict between a scholastic orthodoxy and a humanizing liberalism—if a newer theology is finding ways to pass behind these, and seek a " classic " Christianity which concentrates on the essentials of the Christian faith, then modern theology owes a deep debt of gratitude to Nathan Söderblom. And it is not Swedish theology only that owes this debt of gratitude.

Gustaf Aulén.

The Editor is indebted to the Rev. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., for the translation of this article.

Art. III.—SAMUEL DAVIDSON'S WORK IN OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP.

Autobiography and Diary of Samuel Davidson. By His Daughter. And other works.[1]

The name of Samuel Davidson will always be honourably associated with the promotion of Old Testament scholarship by the fact that he was the first founder of a chair in the Department of Theology directly connected with the University of London. In this, as in other respects, Samuel Davidson was a pioneer. The chair of Old Testament studies, which has now been in existence since 1926, is based on an endowment accepted by the University and provided out of the estate of the founder. The University directly appoints to this chair, and the holder of the chair is directly responsible to the University for the performance of its duties. There are, of course, other Divinity chairs, the holders of which work in connection with the Faculty of Theology in this University, but these foundations exist primarily to meet the needs of the theological colleges which are affiliated as schools to the University. The colleges directly appoint to these chairs and pay the salaries of the professors, who, however, usually become recognized teachers of the University.[2] It is much to be hoped that the precedent set by the Davidson chair will be followed by other foundations of a similar character.

I propose in this article to survey the work of Davidson in the department of Old Testament scholarship and to attempt to appraise its value. But before proceeding with this task I must say something about Davidson's career.

Samuel Davidson was born in 1806, and died in 1898.

[1] For full list of Samuel Davidson's works, see end of article.

[2] Recently, however, the University has recognized the status of these chairs by appointing their holders as titular professors.

He was by birth an Ulsterman, and both his parents were of Scottish descent, and Presbyterians. In 1824 he entered the Royal Academical Institution of Belfast with the intention of qualifying for admission to the Presbyterian ministry. He was licensed to preach in November, 1833. In 1835 he was offered by the General Synod of Ulster the newly-created professorship of Biblical Criticism at the Belfast College, a post which he held until 1841. In 1838 he received from the University of Aberdeen the degree of LL.D., and in 1839 his first book *Lectures on Biblical Criticism* appeared.

In 1842 he became Professor in the Lancashire Independent College at Manchester, occupying the chair of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History. A notable point in his career was his first visit to Germany in the summer of 1844, during which he became acquainted with Neander, Hupfeld, Tholuck and others—he began in this way a series of friendships which lasted throughout his life. He was indeed a pioneer in England in bringing to the notice of English students the work of German scholars, by which he was himself profoundly influenced. At first his interest was concentrated on New Testament subjects, and in 1848 he published a lecture on the ecclesiastical polity of the New Testament, and his elaborate introduction to the New Testament in three volumes appeared in 1848, 1849 and 1851. After the publication of the first volume he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Halle. In 1855 appeared his book *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament.* Meanwhile (in 1854) he had been consulted by Messrs. Longmans with reference to a new edition of Horne's *Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures,* and at their invitation he undertook to re-write the Introduction to the Old Testament. The result of this arrangement was the appearance in October, 1856, as part of Volume II of the tenth edition of Horne's work, of a volume on *The Text of the Old Testament considered : with a Treatise on Sacred Interpretation and a brief Introduction to the Old Testament Books and the Apocrypha.* The amazing industry embodied in this work may be measured by the fact that it embraces no

less than 1,060 printed pages apart from the indexes. The appearance of this book marks the beginning of the controversy which ended in Davidson's resignation of his chair. The author was indicted for having surrendered the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and was accused of heresy and plagiarism from the Germans.[1] Davidson, however, had many powerful friends, including such scholars as Bishop Thirlwall and Dr Cureton, the famous Syriac specialist. He was presented with a handsome testimonial on retiring to Cheshire, where for some time he was engaged in private tuition.

The year 1862 marks a new point in Davidson's career. In this year he was elected examiner in Scripture in London University; this led to his removal to London, where he devoted himself to literary work, becoming a contributor to *The Athenaeum*, and *The Westminster Review*. He also wrote articles for Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, Smith's *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*, and for the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. He died April 1st, 1898, and was buried in Hampstead New Cemetery.

II.

The first thing to remark about Davidson's Biblical scholarship is the massive scale on which it was built. He was no mere specialist in the Old Testament, but equally at home in the Bible as a whole, including the Apocrypha. His New Testament work is indeed remarkable. Thus in 1894 the third edition of *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Critical, Exegetical and Theological* was issued in two large volumes, embracing well over 1,200 large printed pages. Here again the influence of German scholarship is much in evidence, especially that of the Tübingen School. The author is rather scornful of "mediatizing views." Another book devoted to New Testament themes is *The Doctrine of the Last Things contained in the New Testament, compared with the Notions of the Jews and*

[1] In a pamphlet that appeared in October, 1857, entitled "Dr Davidson, his heresies, contradictions and plagiarisms."

the Statements of the Church Creeds, 1882. This little book is well-written. It contains a lucid and well-balanced statement of New Testament doctrine, though the Jewish factor is not sufficiently set forth.

I turn to Davidson's Old Testament work with which this lecture is primarily concerned ; and in this connection I propose to say something first of all about his work as a lexicographer. In 1865 he published *Fürst's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, translated from the German*, and the fourth edition appeared in 1871.

This is not the place to attempt to appraise the value of Fürst's work generally ; some of his treatises are still important and valuable ; but the Lexicon is now obsolete, though in its day it was very useful to students. For one thing, it countenances some very dubious etymological connections with Indo-Germanic roots. It has been superseded by later and more scientific works, not only on the Continent but also in England.

In England the appearance in 1891 of the first part of the great *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, edited by Brown, Briggs and Driver, marks a turning point in Hebrew studies. The Lexicon itself was completed in 1906. It is instructive to notice the rubric printed on the title page which runs as follows :—

> " Edited with constant reference to the Thesaurus of Gesenius as completed by E. Rödiger, and with authorized use of the latest German editions of Gesenius' *Handworterbuch über das Alte Testament.*"

The editors refer in the Preface to Gesenius, who died in 1842, as " the father of modern Hebrew Lexicography." They also say that

> " they have made use of the Thesaurus of Gesenius on every page with increasing admiration for the tireless diligence, philological insight and strong good sense of this great lexicographer."

Julius Fürst was a pupil of Gesenius at Halle ; but his Lexicon did not stand in the true line of succession, and as we have seen, was ultimately superseded. Nevertheless, it

possessed, some merits—it was on the whole carefully compiled, and it had prefixed to it a useful "Introduction giving a short history of Hebrew Lexicography."

We can measure the difference between the old and the new when we recall one great advance in the Oxford work—I mean the splendid contribution made by Driver in the treatment of the Hebrew prepositions. The whole of this is entirely new and marks a permanent advance.

III.

Davidson was much interested in the problems relating to the text of the Old Testament. In this connection I should like to say something about three of his books which are relevant to the matter. These are *A Treatise on Biblical Criticism exhibiting a systematic view of that science* (new edition, Edinburgh, 1854); *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, revised from critical sources; being an attempt to present a purer and more correct text than the received one of Van der Hooght, by the aid of the best existing materials; with the principal various readings found in MSS, Ancient Versions, Jewish books and writers, parellels, quotations, etc., etc.* (London, 1855); and *On a fresh revision of the English Old Testament* (London, 1873).

The first of these (on Biblical Criticism) is a substantial volume embracing well over 900 pages. It is divided into two parts dealing with the Old and New Testament respectively. It is noteworthy that the author in this work is concerned almost exclusively with what we should call the lower criticism, mainly the text. Of the opening chapters three are devoted to the Hebrew language, and six to the text; then follow nine chapters dealing with the ancient versions; Chapters XX and following are devoted to the consideration of cognate themes and parallel passages, quotations from the Old Testament in the New, quotations from Rabbinical writings, Hebrew MSS, critical conjectures, etc. The final chapter of Part I gives a number of discussions of selected passages which in their present form offer textual difficulties. Davidson's remarks on these passages are not

without interest; they exhibit a conservative tendency which he afterwards outgrew to a large extent. We may note as an illustration his treatment of I Sam., vi, 19.

> ("And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had looked into the Ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and three score and ten men; and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter").

Here the obvious difficulty lies in the incredibly large number of people who were slaughtered. As Davidson remarks grimly, "It did not escape Tindal and Voltaire." After reviewing various ingenious explanations for evading the difficulty the author concludes that "The text as it stands appears to be corrupt," and proceeds to deal with the passage critically in the light of the ancient versions and other evidence. He says:

> "Three MSS of Kennicott 84, 210, 418 and two others, *viz.:* the Paris one cited by Houbigant, and that of Breithaupt cited at Jarchi's version, omit the three words meaning 'fifty thousand men,' leaving only 'seventy men.' Josephus omits the same, though elsewhere he often has larger numbers, not commonly smaller ones than the Hebrew text contains. Hence his testimony is weighty. The Syriac, with which the Arabic agrees, has 5,070 instead of 50,070, but even then the number is incredibly large. The Septuagint, Chaldee, and Vulgate have the common reading. Thus external evidence is in favour of the received text. Yet the internal necessity is so urgent, that the text must be pronounced corrupt. We agree with the five MSS mentioned, and with such critics as Kennicott, Tychsen and Michaelis, Dathe, Hufnagel, Jahn, Thenius, etc., in thinking that the three words appended by some Rabbin, were a marginal gloss, and afterwards taken into the text. They appear to have been written in the margin by one who thought that the seventy were equivalent to 50,000; as Tychsen conjectures, and produce an allegorical gloss from the Talmud to the

effect that every one of the seventy was equivalent to 50,000. Or we may suppose with Reinke that the numeral letter equalling 70 stood at first in the text; that a reader or copyist may have found in another copy the letter equalling 50, and either written it in the margin of the text, or taken it into his MS itself."

The second work of Davidson to be mentioned in this connection is the one already referred to entitled *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, revised from critical sources*; the preface is dated August, 1855. It presents a synopsis of various readings arranged chapter by chapter in each book of the Hebrew Bible according to the Hebrew order. Thus it is easy to turn up any particular passage. Account is taken not merely of variant readings in Hebrew MSS but also the readings of the ancient versions, including the Septuagint, Syriac, Samaritan, and others. This is a distinctly useful piece of work and may still be consulted with profit.

The third book we referred to, entitled *On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament*, was published in 1873. It contains 153 pages, and two indexes, and is one of the most readable of Davidson's works. The book, which is well arranged, consists of two parts dealing respectively with the text and translation. The difficulty and uncertainty that beset the received text of the Old Testament are well discussed and illustrated. In Part II such points are discussed as the rectification of the divisions into chapters and verses, the arrangement of the rhythmical sections in lines (this applies not only to the poetical books proper, but also to the prophetical books). It is interesting to note that Davidson argues in favour of the Apocrypha forming part of a revised translation of the Bible. He was also in favour of admitting in certain cases corrections of the text. Davidson also took much interest in the Second Book of Esdras, which, curiously enough, has a Latin and not a Greek text, being the only book of the Apocrypha which does not rest on an official Greek text. It was in fact preserved in Latin Biblical MSS and so

became intimately associated with the Vulgate; but it forms no part of the Canon of the Latin Bible, but was regarded simply as an appendix to the Latin Bible. The translators of our English Bible, by including it in the official Apocrypha, have invested it with a semi-Canonical or Deutero-Canonical rank, and have thus added a book to the Bible.

A characteristic passage showing the author's point of view with regard to the problem of revision may be quoted here :—

> "The difficulties attaching to a new version will appear formidable. To rectify the text itself is not easy; to reach the true sense is a process not seldom uncertain. There are indeed excellent helps. We have the valuable versions of De Witte, Bunsen and Zunz. The lexicons of Gesenius are still the best. The critical works of Ewald, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Gesenius, Tuch, and others, with the light they throw on the Hebrew documents are available. But a translator of the original should be able to decide where the great masters of Hebrew disagree. He has to correct the lexicons, to avoid the errors even of excellent versions, and to choose the sense of a word or passage which an accomplished Hebraist may possibly reject. He must carefully shun the weaknesses of the best scholars themselves. It is not enough to know what the greatest scholars think about a phrase; he must be able to weigh their opinions in his own balance" (page 71).

In the course of his discussion the author gives some illustrations of infelicitous renderings. It is well known that the prophets occasionally sharpen their discourse or invective by the use of assonance or plays upon words. In the original language the balance or antithesis between sound and sense is carefully preserved; but this is naturally very hard to reproduce in translation, and translators have often failed in the attempt. Davidson quotes a particularly unfortunate example from the pen of the late Dr Cheyne (though he does not mention the great scholar by name).

It is a rendering of Is., V, 7, and runs as follows :—"And he looked for *reason*, but behold *treason* for *right*, but behold *fright*."

IV.

The next work to be considered, before we proceed to examine Davidson's elaborate *Introduction to the Old Testament* is his essay on *The Canon of the Bible : its formation, history and fluctuations* (1877 ; third edition revised 1878). This is an expansion of an article originally written for the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It will be noticed that it deals with the whole Bible, and not merely with the Old Testament. The scope of the book can be seen from the chapter headings, which run as follows :

The Old Testament from its beginning to its close. (2)
The Samaritan and Alexandrine Canons. (3)
Number and Order of the Separate Books. (4)
Use of the Old Testament by the first Christian writers, and the Fathers till the time of Origen. (5)
The New Testament Canon in the First Three Centuries. (6)
The Bible Canon from the Fourth Century to the Reformation. (7)
Order of the New Testament books. (8)
Summary of the Subject. (9)
The Canon in the Confession of different Churches. (10)
The Canon from Semler to the present time, with reflections on its readjustment. (11)

Though the criticism embodied in these chapters is now somewhat old-fashioned, the salient points of the subject are well brought out. The following extract from the chapters on the formation of the Old Testament Canon will illustrate the author's method and point of view. He says :

> " The man who first gave public sanction to a portion of the national literature was Ezra, who laid the foundation of a Canon. He was the leader in restoring the

> theocracy after the Exile, a ready scribe in the law of Moses, who had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord and to teach in Israel statutes and judgements. As we are told that he brought the book of the law of Moses before the congregation and read it publicly, the idea naturally arises that he was the final redactor of the Pentateuch, separating it from the historical work consisting of Joshua, and the subsequent writings, of which it formed the commencement. Such was the first Canon given to the Jewish Church after its reconstruction—ready for temple service as well as synagogue use. Henceforward the Mosaic book became an authoritative guide in spiritual, ecclesiastical, and civil matters, as we infer from various passages in Ezra and Nehemiah and from the Chronicler's own statements in the book bearing his name."

The position thus assigned to Ezra may be regarded as essentially correct; and this view is corroborated by the place given to Ezra in later Jewish legend where he is represented as the restorer of the law—he is, in fact, pictured as a second Moses (*cf.* II *Esdras*, xiv). Davidson sums up the matter by saying:

> " He edited *the law*, making the first Canon or collection of books, and giving it an authority which it had not before."[1]

Though open to correction in points of detail, the little treatise on the Canon of the Bible is well worth reading. It is written in a fresh and interesting style, and surveys the whole field in a competent manner. The book attained a considerable measure of success, and went into a third edition.

V.

I must now say something about Davidson's most considerable contribution to Old Testament scholarship. I refer to his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, published in three volumes, 1862-3, and embracing over 1,500 pages. It

[1] *op. cit.* p. 24.

will be impossible here to do more than give a general idea of the character of this work as a whole, and illustrate his method by one or two examples. Thus Volume I opens with a long chapter, embracing 134 pages, devoted to an elaborate discussion of the Authorship, Composition, and Date of the Pentateuch. The following points are discussed :

(1) Places adverse to the Mosaic authorship, containing notices historical, geographical, archæological, and explanatory.

(2) The writer intimates that he was in Palestine.

(3) Omissions unfavourable to Mosaic authorship.

(4) Two leading documents at least in the Pentateuch.

(5) The pieces where the distinctive usage of the two occurs exhibit such internal and essential peculiarities as to exclude unity of authorship.

(6) Other documents probably employed.

(7) The respective ages of the Elohist, Jehovist, and junior Elohist.

(8) Historical traces of the existence of the first four books in other Biblical writers.

(9) Tables of Elohistic and Jehovistic sections.

(10) Unity of authorship discountenanced by duplicates.

(11) Diversities, confusedness and contradictions.

(12) Repetitions observable in the legislative parts.

(13) The peculiar nature of the legislation in the different books.

(14) The unsuitableness of sections and paragraphs.

(15) Legendary and traditional elements adverse to Mosaic authorship.

(16) No important difference between the language of the Pentateuch and that of other books written shortly before the return from the Babylonian captivity.

(17) Evidences of Mosaic authorship in the Pentateuch.

(18) Does the Pentateuch expressly claim to be the work of Moses himself ?

(19) Testimony of Deuteronomy xxxi.

(20) Meaning of the phrase " book of the law " in the Old Testament.

(21) Testimony of the New Testament regarding the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch.

(22) When the present Pentateuch was completed.

It must be remembered that when Davidson wrote his Introduction the criticism of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch) had not yet reached its modern form. The dominant view regarded the so-called GRUND-SCHRIFT, *i.e.*, the main part of the document now commonly called the Priestly writing (equals P.) as the oldest component part. In this connection the influence of Tuch is apparent. This scholar in his *Commentar über die Genesis*, 1838, maintained that there were only two authors, one of whom supplemented or " filled in " the work of the other ; (1) The " Grundschrift " or the Elohist, and (2) the Supplementer or " Jehovist." The first document was composed by a Priest in the time of Saul, the second must be referred to the reign of Solomon. Stahelin extended the theory to the other books of the Pentateuch.[1]

In the light of this view it is easy to understand how Davidson could reach his conclusion that the book of the Law discovered in the eighteenth year of King Josiah was the complete Pentateuch. Davidson said [2]:

> " Thus history makes no earlier mention of the present Pentateuch than the reign of Josiah. It had been completed shortly before, but was put aside and disregarded till the King set about a thorough reform of Judah, when it was brought forth into the light of day and exalted to its rightful place."

[1] See Spurrell *Genesis*, 2nd ed. p. xix.

[2] Intro. to O.T. Vol. I, p. 133.

We cannot agree with such as think that Hilkiah practised a fraud on this occasion by substituting a composition of his own, or one concocted by himself and a few others. Whatever may have been the circumstances of the times, it is inconceivable that a band of theocratic patriots should have recourse to such means to supply a firm foundation for the popular belief, and at the same time to increase the authority of the Priesthood. Neither the whole work, nor the book of Deuteronomy, was brought forth from a place where it had been designedly put to be shown to the King for the first time; for how could Hilkiah say to Shaphan, "I have found the *book* of the law," if the whole book were really new?

It will be remembered that in his work on the Canon, published later, Ezra is regarded as the final redactor of the Pentateuch, and as having separated it from the historical books that follow.

As illustrating the method and scale of these discussions it may be mentioned that the books of the Bible are treated elaborately one by one. Thus the book of Genesis embraces pages 135-210, and the discussion is arranged under the following heads.

(1) Contents.

(2) History and Science bearing on mythology.

(3) Interpretation of the record of man's fall.

(4) Cainite and Sethite genealogies in the fourth and fifth chapters.

(5) Longevity of the antediluvians.

(6) Antiquity of man.

(7) The Deluge.

(8) The Sons of God and daughters of men cohabiting.

(9) The plural appeleation of Deity-Elohim.

(10) The XLIX chapter of Genesis.

(11) Shiloh in Chapter XLIX.

It will thus be seen that Davidson interprets

" Introduction " in a very wide sense. It includes exegesis, and the discussion of philosophical and theological questions.

To pass to a book of a different kind—the book of Psalms—we may remark that Davidson's treatment is much more in line with what is commonly understood as " Introduction." There are good discussions of such matters as the title and classification according to subject matter, etc. On the question of Davidic authorship Davidson is cautious, accepting it in some cases, but not in all. Referring to the seventy-three Psalms traditionally ascribed to David, he says [1]:

> " Internal evidence is more to be relied on than a mere heading; though it may be unduly estimated, especially as regards diction and style. How uncertain it is to rely on the titles ascribing seventy-three psalms to David may be seen from the fact that Ewald, resting mainly on the language and contents, attributes to David no more than the following: XI, VII, XXIV, CI, XV, XXIX, XIX, VIII, XXXII, III, IV, XVIII, CX, XX, II. It is possible to give too little weight to the ascription of authorship in the titles, and to rest too much on a kind of internal evidence which is not decisive. Ewald, Hitzig, and some later critics are perhaps too prone to discard the Davidic authorship. Others who think that we can with certainty deny him the authorship of those psalms only which contain clear references to the Captivity, err in the opposite extreme. A nice perception of all internal features, with an ability to estimate evidence at its proper worth, is the best guarantee for a safe conclusion on this point."

It may be added that a section is devoted to the discussion of possible Maccabean Psalms in the Canonical Collection; but this is rejected mainly on the ground that it is inconsistent with the history of the Old Testament Canon.

One further remark may be made as to the Introduction. Davidson's treatment of the book of Daniel is a good example of his method. The unity and linguistic character of the

[1] *op. cit.* Vol. II, 255.

book, as well as its authorship, are fully discussed. The Maccabean date is accepted, and its apocalyptic character is emphasized. The difficulty as to the *bona fides* of the author in professing to speak in the name of Daniel is dismissed with the remark :

> " It is wrong to view the matter in this light. He was no deceiver or dishonest man. His motive was good and right. To effect his purpose the more successfully he chose a prophet renowned for wisdom in the tradition of his nation as the medium of communicating theocratic truths to his suffering countrymen. He uses Daniel and apocalyptic visions supposed to be revealed to him, as harmless but effectual drapery to set forth ideas fitted to sustain the oppressed people of God in the midst of persecution."[1]

VI.

It is not possible to do more here and now by way of comment on, and illustration of, his Old Testament work. We must proceed to ask, what position is to be assigned to Davidson as a scholar and critic ? He was, of course, a thoroughly well equipped Hebraist, and could handle grammatical, textual, and philological questions with a master's hand. This is made evident on almost every page of the Introduction. I have already called attention to his translation of *Furst's Hebrew Lexicon.* He was also a diligent student of Syriac—more especially in connection with New Testament studies—almost to the end of his life. Of his work in the higher criticism of the Old Testament we may say that its merits are largely those of a pioneer. Dr Davidson was a profound student of German critical and theological work. He spent a good deal of time in Germany, and came to know and enjoy the friendship of many German scholars. These visits are described in the Autobiography, and the earliest of them in 1844. In the summer vacation of that year he met in this way Zumpt and Neander ;

[1] *op. cit.* Vol. III, p. 199.

> "I also," he says, "became acquainted with Bleek of Bonn, with whom a friendly intercourse was maintained by letter up to his death; with Hupfeld, 'my dear and valued friend'; with Rödiger and Tholuck. I visited Bretschneider at Gotha, and found his room enveloped in tobacco smoke. He was a kindly old man, a learned theologian, a good preacher. I was especially attracted to Halle, the seat of Prussia's leading theological University, where Gesenius had laboured and died; where Tholuck still exercised a salutary influence and Julius Muller was lecturing on Dogmatik with applause."

It must be remembered that the *Introduction to the Old Testament* was published in 1863, some years before the Great Revolution effected by the work of Wellhausen. In consequence it is largely antiquated, but it is still valuable as summing up and illustrating the earlier phases of criticism. Moreover, the discussion is so full and ample that this, in itself, is illuminating. One other point which I have already alluded to ought to be emphasized here—I mean the width of his interest in Bible study as a whole. His Bible included not only the Old Testament, but also the Apocrypha and the New Testament. Indeed some scholars would rank his contribution to New Testament criticism as the most important part of his work. Note for instance the long discussion given to his views on the Fourth Gospel by the late Archdeacon Watkins in his Bampton Lectures. It must be admitted that Davidson was learned rather than original; of the solidity and massiveness of his learning there can be no possible doubt. He rendered great services to Biblical scholarship, and like the Hebrew studies he loved, his name has fallen into undue neglect. He was above all a fearless champion of what he conceived to be the truth. Of his zeal for the Bible study he loved, he has left a permanent memorial in the University Foundation which bears his name. The motto which best expresses the principle that guided and controlled his life may best be expressed in the famous words drawn from one of the books of the Apocrypha:

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PRAEVALET

WORKS BY DR SAMUEL DAVIDSON.

1. *Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, 1839. (Edinburgh).

2. *Sacred Hermeneutics*, 1843.

3. *Giesler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, translated from the German, 1846-47, 2 vols.

4. *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, 1848; 2nd ed., 1854. (London).

5. *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1848, 1849, 1851, 3 vols. (Bagster).

6. *A Treatise on Biblical Criticism* (superseding No. 1), 1852, 2 vols. (Bagster). New ed. 1855. (London).

7. *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament revised from Critical Sources*, 1855. (London).

8. *The Text of the Old Testament considered:* with a Treatise on Sacred Interpretations, and a brief Introduction to the Old Testament Books and the Apocrypha (forming Vol. II of the 10th edition of Horne's *Introduction to the Scriptures*), 1856; 2nd ed. 1859. (London).

9. *Facts, Statements, and Explanations*, connected with the publication of the above (No. 8), 1857. (Longmans).

10. *An Introduction to the Old Testament, Critical, Historical, and Theological*, 1862-63, 3 vols. (Williams & Norgate).

11. *Fürst's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, translated from the German, 1865; 4th ed. 1871. Preface to this Translation, 1867.

12. *An Introduction to the New Testament* (superseding No. 5), 1868, 2 vols.; 2nd ed. 1882.

13. *On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament*, 1873.

14. *The New Testament*, translated from the Critical Text of Von Tischendorf, with an Introduction on the Criticism, Translation, and Interpretation of the Book, 1875; 2nd ed. 1876.

15. *The Canon of the Bible*, 1877 ; 3rd ed. 1880.

16. *The Doctrine of Last Things contained in the New Testament, compared with the Notions of the Jews and the Statements of Church Creeds*, 1882. 12mo.

Articles in Kitto's *Cyclopedia.*

Articles in Smith's *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology.*

Articles in 9th edition of *Encyclopedia Britannica.*

Articles in the *Theological Review*, 1869, 1870, on the Jewish Messiah.

An Essay on Alford's *Greek Testament.*

Began to write in *Athenæum* in 1862 ; first article being a review of Forster's book on the Sinaitic Inscriptions.

Reviewed also in *Athenæum :*

Tischendorf's *Greek Testament*, Vol. I, last edition.

Tregelles' *Greek Testament.*

Successive Volumes of the *Speaker's Commentary.*

Stanley's *Jewish Church*, Vol. III.

Reuss's *Les Prophetes*, etc., etc.

Notices of Books on Philosophy and Theology, under " Contemporary Literature " in *Westminster Review*, 1871, 1872, and part of 1873.

Art. IV.—HAMAN-AGOBARD[1] OR ST. AGOBARD?

1. *Agobardi Opera.* Ed. by Baluze, 1666. Text and Notes. Both reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, 104, coll. 9-352.
2. *Geschichte der Juden.* By H. Graetz. 2nd Edition, 1871. pp. 223-232.
3. *Acta Sanctorum.* Bollandists. June 6th. p. 748.
4. *Agobard von Lyon und die Judenfrage, in Festschrift . . . dem Prinz Luitpold.* By Friedrich Wiegand. Erlangen, 1901. I. 221-250.

The early part of the ninth century was a remarkable period in the history of France, for thoughts came to the surface then, and ideals were seen, which afterwards were long lost sight of, not to say buried, and were revived and put into practice only after nearly a thousand years had passed away. It was wrong, said Agobard, to settle disputes by duels,[2] or to determine innocence or guilt by ordeal.[3] And it was wrong, wrote Smaragdus to Charlemagne (*c.* 742-814) or his successor Louis le Debonnair (814-840), to hold slaves at all, for all men have equal rights.[4] The claim, says Jonas Bishop of Orleans (*ob.* 843) to superior intellect, or to greater wealth, does not do away with the natural rights of every man. There is no justification for mastership on the one side and servitude on the other.[5]

[1] Graetz, p. 226. Agobard was Archbishop of Lyons, A.D. *c.* 823-840.

[2] *Adv. legem Gunobardi*, Migne, coll. 113-126.

[3] *De Divinis sententiis*, Migne, coll. 249-268.

[4] " Prohibe ergo, clementissime rex, ne in regno tuo captivitas fiat. . . . Conditione enim aequabiliter creati sumus, sed aliis alii culpa subacti." (*De via regia*, xxx, Migne *P.L.* coll. 967b, 968b.)

[5] *De institutione laicali*, II, 22 (Migne, *P.L.* 106, coll. 213-215). See further P. Allard, *Origines du servage en France*, 1913, pp. 315 *sq.*, 322-324.

These doctrines, which must then have seemed strange to many, were the outcome of Charlemagne's reign. With all his strength and success in warfare, spreading as he did his dominions southward over the Lombards, north-west over the Saxons, and eastwards as far as Bohemia and Pannonia,[1] he had time (like Napoleon, but with less self-seeking) to attend to the details of his subjects' comforts, and their advancement in education and religion. For he seems to have been a really religious man. He may also have been moved by the missionary influences of the eighth century, in which our own English Church took so leading a part.

For England had been comparatively free from wars, and education had not suffered as much there as on the Continent. So Charlemagne brought Alcuin of York to his court, and listened to his advice. Perhaps it was due to Alcuin, perhaps to the Emperor himself, that the serfs of all degrees (and there appear to have been many degrees of serfdom then) were so cared for as to have Churches provided for them and opportunities of worship. Their lords' powers were also limited.[2]

We must distinguish carefully between serfs (villeins) and slaves. The former, though bound to the soil and subject to the control of their lords in most departments of their lives, were free against all other persons, serfs or others. But slaves as such were mere chattels. and could be sold from master to master, or even sent abroad. What the proportion of the two classes was in the Frankish Empire at the beginning of the ninth century is not easy to determine. The Church, with its monasteries and Church lands, had no slaves, though many serfs. Alcuin himself, when twitted with holding so many of the latter, for he was now a wealthy man with many monasteries under him, replied

[1] See Gibbon, ch. xliv (Bohn's ed. v. 410), and in more detail, W. T. Waugh, *Germany*, 1916, p. 32.

[2] See P. Allard, *op. cit.* pp. 157 *sqq.* Yet Dr. G. G. Coulton gives a terrible picture of the power of the lord over his serfs (*The Mediaeval Village*, 1925).

that he had never purchased a single slave for his own personal use. Slaves in the proper sense of the word seem to have been comparatively few.

Who and what then were the slaves? A hundred years later, the wholesale importation of Slavs as captives in war, numbering (it is said) eighty thousand, gave the familiar name. But at the beginning of the ninth century slaves appear to have been seen in any quantity only in the hands of slave-dealers, partly Venetians but chiefly Jews, who bought and sold them like any other beasts. In the great majority of cases they must have been heathen, for according to the laws no Christian might be a slave to a Jew.[1] They were only heathen chattels, and might be sold at the ports of the Mediterranean into slavery among Turks and North African potentates.[2] Or a Jew might retain these poor heathen as his own personal slaves, with the intention of making them become Jews.[3]

This it was[4] that led to Agobard's famous letters and diatribes.[5] In the first (A) he asks advice on the subject

[1] Agobard, alas, had to remind Christians not to sell Christians to Jews (Migne, coll. 72). The Council of Chalons (743) seems even to prohibit the sale of any one (heathen as well as Christian) to a Jew (*D. Chr. Antt.* ii, 1909a).

[2] *Cf.* Migne, coll. 76.

[3] Bass Mullinger in *D. Chr. Antt.* ii, 1902-1910 (s.v. Slavery) is excellent, but barely reaches our period.

[4] For, as Wiegand says (p. 239) a Church (*Geistlichkeit*) which was at that time doing missionary work among Saxons and Danes, Slavs and Avars, would naturally direct its attention to the members of the heathen diaspora within the Empire.

[5] The standard investigation of their relative chronology is by B. Simson in *Jahrbücher des frankischen Reichs*, 1874, i, 393-396. He bases his conclusions on the dates of the deaths of some of the persons mentioned, and on the statements about the Commissioners (*Missi*) of the Emperor. All five documents fall within the years 824 and 828 (Wiegand, p. 244).

A. *Consultatio et Supplicatio . . . ad Proceres Palatii de baptismo Judaicorum mancipiorum. Reverendissimis . . . Adalardo, Walae, et Helisarcho* (before 826, when Adalard died. "Missi" are not not mentioned). Baluze i, 98-102; Migne *P.L.* 104, coll. 99-106.

B. *Epistola ad Proceres Palatii contra Praeceptum impium de*

Continued at foot of next page.

generally. In the second (B) a concrete case had arisen. A heathen girl, a slave in a Jewish household,[1] had been won to Christianity and been baptized, and had, in consequence, been persecuted. As a Christian she could no longer be in slavery to a Jew, so she must be released. There was, however, no question of this being done without payment. Agobard makes it clear that in such cases the Church was ready to recoup the owner with the price he had paid for the slave, perhaps some twenty or thirty *solidi*.[2] The Church could not well do more. To have paid what the Jew hoped to receive by a future sale, or what he estimated the slave's value for work in the household, was not practical. It was only possible to see that the owner suffered no direct pecuniary loss. This much the Church would do, and there is no evidence that the number of such cases was as yet too great for the Church to meet.

But the Jews of Lyons were in an uproar at once. Had they not managed to secure a law from Louis le Debonnair[3]

[1] The phrase implies that she was not a Jewess by birth and upbringing, though completely in Jewish surroundings. "Quandam feminam ex Iudaismo ad Christianismum gratia Christi translatam, graves persecutiones sustinere propter fidem quam suscepit Christi, quas per ipsius feminae breviculum potestis cognoscere" (Ep. B. Migne, col. 175).

[2] Ep. A. Migne, col. 103. The Council of Macon (581) "directs that Jewish or pagan proprietors shall be bound to surrender Christian slaves for a ransom of 12 *solidi*" (Bass Mullinger, *D. Chr. Antt.* ii, 1907 b). It may be noted here that Agobard expressly states that neither the children nor the slaves of Jews ought to be taken by force (Ep. B. Migne, col. 178).

[3] The Germans call him Louis the Pious, presumably because he ended his days in a monastery, but it is more in accordance with his actions to call him Louis the Good-natured. He seems in fact to have been very squeezable.

---

baptismo Judaicorum mancipiorum (826, a threat of *Missi* being sent). Baluze i, 192-197; Migne, coll. 173-178.

C. *De Insolentia Judaeorum* (826-7, *Missi* have been sent). Baluze i, 59-66; Migne, coll. 69-76.

D. *Epistola Agobardi, Bernardi, et Eaof* (or *Eaor*) *de Judaicis superstitionibus* (same date). Baluze i, 66-98; Migne, coll. 77-100.

E. *Epistola . . . ad Nibridium Episcopum Narbonensem de cavendo convitu et societate Judaica* (828, the year Nibridius died). Baluze i, 102-107; Migne, coll. 107-114.

—at least they said so, and probably with truth, though Agobard affects to doubt it—that no slaves should be baptized unless the owner had given his consent? What! cries Agobard, Had the Christians of Cæsar's household (Phil. iv, 22) asked Nero's leave before being baptized? The requirement is unreasonable, and contrary to history.

The Jews, headed by Everard their "Magister," doubtless a Gentile Christian official appointed over them by the Emperor, threatened to get Commissioners sent from the Court, who would speedily bring Agobard to a better mind.[1] They came, and bullied the Christians and Christian priests in Lyons, but Agobard himself happened to be away. He writes another letter (C) to the Emperor in consequence, complaining of the "insolentia" of the Jews, sending at the same time a joint letter composed by himself and other Bishops (D), recapitulating the Canons of Councils and the decrees of Kings, and enumerating at some length the grievous superstitions of Jews in general. Lastly, there is a short letter to Nibridius the Bishop of Narbonne on the same subject, bidding him warn his people against all social intercourse with Jews (E).

We may now turn to some of the chief points in Agobard's criticism of the Judaism and Jews of his day.

1. He says that they hold that the Letters of the Alphabet are eternal, existing before the beginning of the world,[2] and that the Law of Moses was many cycles of years earlier than the world.[3] Further, there is not a page or a sentence in the Old Testament on which the Jews do not

[1] Charlemagne had "established as a regular part of the state machinery an institution which his forbears had used only occasionally. From the ranks of his nobles, counsellors, and clergy, he annually chose a number of trustworthy and experienced men whom he sent, by twos or threes, on tours of inspection through the realm. These *missi*, as they were called, held very wide powers. It was their duty to promulgate new laws, to communicate royal instructions to the counts, to hear and investigate all complaints, to enquire carefully into the conduct of the count and his subordinates, to collect information as to the state of the Church, and even to report on the morals of the people in general" (Waugh, *op. cit.* p. 33).

[2] Ep. D. Migne, col. 87.

[3] *ibid.* "multis annorum curriculis ante mundum."

make up lies and superstitions.[1] He also quotes Jerome's allusion to the great "number of traditions of the Pharisees which they to-day call Deuterosis."[2]

2. Their opinions about God are unworthy. He has a body.[3] He sits on a throne like an earthly king, "and is within, as it were, a great palace."[4] One of his seven trumpets is a thousand cubits long.[5] Observe that we can hardly blame Agobard for taking these and other Homiletic and semi-playful illustrations (*Haggadoth*) literally, for many Polish Jews of the first half of the nineteenth century were equally mistaken, and several learned Christian writers of the same period agreed with them.

3. Of special interest are Agobard's own statements of the opinions of the Jews about our Lord. For they form the earliest existing evidence of the Jewish life of him which is known as the *Toledoth Jeshu*.[6] He was, it says, a worthy man and a pupil of John the Baptist, and had Disciples, among whom was one named Kephas, *i.e.*, Peter, so called because of the hardness and dullness of his intelligence.[7] When Jesus was expected by the people on a feast-day certain boys of his school met him, singing out of respect for their master, "Osanna to the Son of David." But at last he was accused of speaking many lies, and was condemned by Tiberius (*sic*) to be thrust into prison. For though he (Jesus) had promised his daughter that she should bear, though still remaining a virgin, she had only

[1] *ibid.*

[2] Ep. D. Migne, col. 88, "Quantae traditiones Pharisaeorum, quas hodie Deuterosis vocant." See Jerome, *Ep.* cxxi, 10 (Vallarsi, i, 883 *sq.*). Δευτερώσεις (Jerome) represents *Mishnaioth*. Jerome in this passage has much to say about the traditions of the Jews.

[3] *ibid.* "corporeum," quoting Jerome, "in quodam loco." I have not been able to trace this reference.

[4] Ep. D. Migne, col. 87. "et magno quamvis palatio continetur."

[5] *ibid.*

[6] This part (Ep. D. Migne, coll. 87 *sq.*), is quoted in Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen*, 1910, pp. 14* *sq.* See also S. Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 1902, pp. 5-7.

[7] "Propter duritiam et hebitudinem sensus."

brought forth a stone.[1] For this reason as a detestable magician was he hung on a pole, where too he was struck on the head by a stone, and so was killed.[2] Then he was buried near a certain conduit (*aquaeductus*), and entrusted to the charge of a certain Jew, but he was carried away at night by a sudden flood of the conduits. Although search was made for him at Pilate's command for twelve months, he was not found even then. So Pilate put them forth a law to this effect: "It is clear," he said, "that he who was put to death by you through envy, and has not been found either in the tomb or in any other place, has risen as he promised. Therefore I order you to worship him. And he who refuses to do so must know that his future shall be in hell."

All this, adds Agobard, have the elders of the Jews made up, and the Jews still read in their stubborn folly, in order that by such interpretations all the truth of the power and suffering of Christ may be made void, and worship may not be rightly addressed to him as God, but be ascribed to him by Pilate's law alone.

It is also said that Peter was in no wise led forth from prison by an angel, as we believe, but was released by the compassion of Herod, by whom Peter's wisdom was greatly praised.[3]

4. The attitude of Jews towards Jesus and Christians in general. They curse him and Christians by name in all their prayers daily, as Jerome says and many Jews confirm.[4]

[1] This is evidently a Jewish perversion of the Christian insistence on the Virgin Birth, and on the Stone (*i.e.* Christ); *cf.* Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, lxxvi and elsewhere.

[2] *Cf.* S. Krauss, *op. cit.* p. 164. Not "crucified." Agobard has already quoted the Jews as saying that Jesus died by compulsion, and not of His own free will prompted by pity ("ex necessitate naturae, non ex voluntate misericordiae," IX. Migne, col. 86).

[3] Is there here confusion with Herod's admiration for John the Baptist?

[4] Ep. C. IV. Migne, coll. 73. *Cf.* "They curse the Lord and his body in all their prayers . . . as had been prophesied 'by the voice of the Lord speaking to the Father. They will curse, but thou wilt bless.'" Ps. cix, 28. Ep. D. IX. Migne, col. 86. See Jerome on Isa. lii, 4. See Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, xvi, 4, with my note.

Elsewhere Agobard says only that they persecute him " in the synagogues of Satan " (Rev., ii, 9 ; iii, 9), quoting Jerome also for this.[1] They even assert that Christians worship idols,[2] and that miracles obtained by the intercessions of the saints were in reality wrought by the devil.[3]

5. Lastly, we must notice what Agobard tells us of the behaviour of the Jews in his time. He says that they

> " began to be carried away with detestable insolence, threatening us with all kinds of harm through the Commissioners they had obtained to pay off their revenge on the Christians."[4]

Further,

> " We suffered at the hands of the partizans of the Jews, for no other reason than that we preached to Christians that they should not sell to Jews Christian slaves, and not permit the Jews themselves to sell Christians into Spain, nor to have hired servants (evidently Christians), for fear that Christian women should observe the Sabbath with them, or should work on the Lord's Day, or have meals with them in Lent, and hired servants eat their meat in the same period, and that no Christian whatever should buy meat slain and porged by Jews and sell it to others, nor drink their wine, and such like."[5]

[1] Ep. D. Migne, col. 88. I cannot find a definite reference in Jerome.

[2] Ep. D. Migne, col. 88.

[3] *ibid.*

[4] " Coeperunt autem efferri quadam odibili insolentia Judaei, comminantes omnibus injuriis nos afficiendos per Missos quos adepti fuerant ad exsolvendam vindictam de Christianis " (Ep. C. Migne, col. 71).

[5] " Haec passi sumus a fautoribus Judaeorum, non ob aliud nisi quia praedicaverimus Christianis, ut mancipia eis Christiana non venderent, ut ipsos Judaeos Christianos vendere ad Hispanias non permitterent, nec mercenarios domesticos habere, ne feminae Christianae cum eis sabbatizarent, et ne diebus Dominicis operarentur, ne diebus Quadragesimae cum eis pranderent, et mercenarii eorum iisdem diebus carnes manducarent, ne quilibet Christianus carnes a Judaeis immolatas et deglubatas emeret, et aliis Christianis venderet, ne vinum illorum biberent, et alia hujusmodi" (Ep. C Migne, coll. 72 *sq.*).

For if their animals are not slain in strict Jewish fashion or prove to be unfit for Jews, they sell the meat to Christians, and the wine which they have mopped up from the floor.[1] Further, they claim that after examining the Canons they do not see why Christians ought to abstain from Jewish foods and drinks.[2] Again,

> " the Commissioners aforesaid (plainly at the instigation of the Jews), lest they (the Jews) should be hindered in their observation of the Sabbath, ordered the usual Saturday markets to be changed, and fixed them for such days as the Jews chose. They say that this change suits the convenience of Christians because of their leisure upon the Lord's day (*i.e.*, they have time for marketing). Whereas (on the contrary, this suggested change) is shown to be [to the profit] rather of the Jews and unprofitable [to the Christians] ; for (as things are at present) those who live near (the town) buy what food they need on Saturday, and are the more free to attend the masses and preachings on Sunday ; and if any come from far, by reason of the market, they attend both vespers (on Saturday) and matins (probably on Sunday, but possibly on Monday), and then after mass has been solemnized they return home edified."[3]

Further,

> " they irreverently dare to preach to Christians what

[1] Ep. C. Migne, col. 73.

[2] " et recursis canonibus non inveniri quare Christiani debeant abstinere a cibis eorum et potibus." (Ep. C. Migne, col. 74).

[3] " Et supradicti Missi, ne sabbatismus eorum impediretur, mercata, quae in sabbatis solebant fieri, transmutari praeceperint, et quibus diebus deinceps frequentari debeant in illorum opinione (' optione,' Baluze) posuerint, dicentes hoc Christianorum utilitati propter diei Dominici vacationem congruere ; cum Judaeis magis probetur [utile et Christianis] inutile : quia et hi qui prope sunt, sabbato ementes victus necessaria, liberius die Dominico missarum solemnitatibus et praedicationibus vacant ; et si qui de longe veniunt, ex occasione mercati, tam vespertinis quam matutinis occurrentes officiis, missarum solemnitate peracta, cum aedificatione revertuntur ad propria" (Ep. C. Migne, col. 75). The three Latin words in [ ] were suggested to me by Dr G. G. Coulton, who also inserts a comma after *mercati*. All earlier writers on Agobard appear carefully to have avoided translating this obscure passage.

they ought to believe and hold, blaspheming in their presence our Lord God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."[1]

They boast of their ancestry,[2] and (against the law) are allowed to build even new synagogues, and—especially galling to human nature—

"it comes to such a pass that uneducated Christians say that Jews preach better to them than our priests."[3]

Agobard also quotes an edict of Childebert which implies that at Easter Jews were wont to march about the streets.[4] But he does not seem to say that this took place at Lyons or in his own day.

No doubt most of Agobard's charges against the theological opinions of the Jews are erroneous, and are due to his ignorance of Judaism from within.[5] Yet he cannot be altogether blamed. It was not an age of mealy-mouthed civilities. Jews themselves have never encouraged dissimulation in attack on either side, and every one is liable to make exaggerated statements and unintentional mistakes.

We are now in a better position to estimate the character of Agobard in his general attitude towards the Jews. An unprejudiced mind will surely grant that he could hardly have

[1] "ut auderent irreverenter praedicare Christianis quid potius credendum esset ac tenendum, blasphementes coram eis Dominum Deum ac Salvatorem nostrum Jesum Christum" (Ep. C. Migne, col. 71).

[2] "Exponunt gloriam parentum suorum" (Ep. C. Migne, col. 74); *Cf.* "Dum se patriarcharum progeniem, justorum genus, prophetarum sobolem, superbo ore proloquuntur" (Ep. E. Migne col. 111).

[3] "Ad hoc pervenitur, ut dicant imperiti Christiani, melius eis praedicare Judaeos quam Presbyteros nostros" (Ep. C. Migne, col. 74 *sq.*).

[4] Was this really due to the Jewish Passover holidays sometimes coinciding with the Christian? Childebert I, son of Clovis, reigned from 511 to 558. (Ep. D. VI. Migne, col. 84; *cf.* VII, Migne, col. 85).

[5] In spite of his claim to have talked with Jews almost every day and to have listened to the mysteries of their erroneous belief. "Nobis . . . qui quotidie pene cum eis loquentes mysteria erroris ipsorum audimus" (*De Jud. Superstit.* ix, end).

refrained from acting as he did in those times and circumstances. He, as Archbishop, was the guardian of the Church's interests in Lyons, and was responsible for the spread of Christianity in at least his own Arch-diocese. Was he then to be slack in endeavouring to win heathens to the Saviour even though they did happen to be slaves in a Jewish household? He was ready, it must be remembered, to pay the legal price for their redemption.

That was the immediate occasion of the chief part of the dispute, and for Agobard's direct action in this few modern Jews would be inclined to condemn him. The question, however, does not stop there. Agobard was also the principal producer of the joint letter (and the sole writer of the letter enclosing it) in which are collected decrees of kings and canons of Councils enumerating Jewish errors, and warning Christians against being led away by them.

But the real reason for the Jewish dislike of Agobard lies deeper than even this. Charlemagne had encouraged Jewish settlers in his dominions for economic reasons. While the upper classes of Christians thought only of war, the farmers of corn and wine, and the poor of their daily work and ability to live at all, the Jews were keen on trade, and by their interdependence were able to succeed in it. Besides, some scholars think that Charlemagne had persuaded at least one family of Jewish scholars (Kalonymus) to come to Mainz, in the hope that they would improve the intellectual standard of their coreligionists. Again, the third member of Charlemagne's embassy to Haroun al Rashid (797) was a Jew named Isaac, who survived his two chiefs, and returned to Charlemagne in honour. The same policy of encouraging the Jews was followed by Louis le Debonnair and Judith his second wife. She, a very able woman, was doing her best to secure the succession to her own son, a desire which the three elder sons of Louis by the first wife naturally resented. The Jews sided with Louis and Judith, while presumably the Church in general, and certainly Agobard in particular, supported the three half-brothers.

Thus before his activity, and the influence that he brought

to bear on Court and Church, the Jews were acquiring a high and important position in the State, and his work and writings did tend to prevent their prestige growing, and even to make their condition a good deal worse than it had been before. Yet no one in those days had any idea of toleration in the modern acceptance of the word. Jews had no more notion of it than Christians. Mohammedans were better, at least as regards their Jewish subjects. Agobard was in this respect no further advanced than other Jews and Christians of his day, although he had gone far ahead of them, as we have seen, in certain non-Jewish directions. He was a keen and able ecclesiastic, doing his best to spread the Gospel, and to make Christians become more worthy of their name. He found his efforts for the Truth, and even for the diminution of slavery, hindered by Jews, and he resisted their manœuvres in what was perhaps the only way available to a man of his time. It is not our way, let us hope. Nor is it the highest way. But we can hardly blame a man of Agobard's antecedents—he had come from Spain—when he saw himself and his cause opposed by prosperous Jews who were not merely in will but also in fact influencing Christians against Christianity. He struck hard and almost too efficiently,[1] but he was a godly and an earnest man, living and working up to the measure of his enlightenment. He was not a Haman ; he was, as his times went, a Saint.

A. Lukyn Williams.

[1] Even so it must be remembered that his diatribes contain none of the venom which disgraces the later Spanish writers, *e.g.* de Spina in his *Fortress of the Faith* (A.D. 1459).

Art. V.—THE BEARING OF THE 21st CHAPTER OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL ON ITS AUTHORSHIP.

We are often assured by the critics of the New Testament that the question of the authorship of the Gospels is of quite secondary importance, that it is not logical to begin with the discussion of the authorship of the books and afterwards to consider their contents, but that we ought to begin by examining the books themselves, which are easily accessible, and then to examine the traditions relating to their authorship. The application of this principle is carried to such extremes in some modern books, that it is quite usual to find no reference whatever made to the external evidence which exists for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel by the Apostle John, or to find it dismissed as worthless in a few lines.

But the evidence for this authorship which is contained in the last chapter of the Gospel is not external and cannot be dismissed in this way.

If the critics were true to their principle that the question of the authorship of this or any other Gospel is of quite secondary importance, they would treat this evidence also with the contempt with which they regard the external evidence. But, for some reason or other, few of them do this, and it will be our purpose to set forth some of the ways in which they get rid of it.

The extraordinary ingenuity which they display shows that, until it is disposed of, they are not at all easy in their minds that they have shown once and for all that most of the matter contained in the Gospel is not a picture of the historic Jesus produced by an eye-witness, but the result of the religious experience of some Christian of the second or third generation cast into the form of a history.

We shall also touch on the way in which some critics have mishandled the external evidence with a view to arriving at the same result.

We are obliged, however unwillingly, to begin by criticizing the comments of Dr Bernard on the last chapter of the Gospel in his commentary in the International Critical series.

Dr Bernard believes that there is much that is historical in the Gospel and that it is based on the recollections of the Apostle John who was the Beloved Disciple, but that it was put into its present form by a disciple of his who may have been the person mentioned by Papias as "the Elder John." He believes that the author of the Gospel was also the author of the three Epistles that go under the name of "John." The author of the second and third of these Epistles calls himself "the Elder." Therefore, in the opinion of Dr Bernard, he cannot have been an Apostle.

This is founded on the opinion that the title "Elder" or "Presbyter" was, in the second century, a sort of official designation of the successors of the Apostles. The Apostle, in the writings of Irenaeus, was one who had "seen the Lord": the Elder was one who carried on the work of the Apostles.

This, Dr Bernard says, is clearly seen in Acts, xv, 4 and 22, and in *Irenaeus' Adv. Haer.*, iv, 26, 2, where we read

> "Wherefore obedience ought to be shown to those Elders who are in the churches, that is to those who have succession from the Apostles."

And again in *Adv. Haer.*, v, 5, 1, "The Elders, the disciples of the Apostles." Dr Bernard says that the word "Elder" in Irenaeus means those

> "who whether officially or unofficially had succeeded to the position of leadership which the Apostles held." (*Commentary*, p. xlvi).

He also lays down, as a principle to which there is no exception, that "Elder" is never used in the sense of "Apostle." (*op. cit.* p. xlvii).

To found such an important conclusion on such an uncertain basis is not convincing. The title " fellow-Elder " is used by St. Peter of himself in his first Epistle, or at any rate is put into his mouth in an Epistle which was early and universally attributed to him. (I Pet., v, 1).

Dr Bernard brushes aside this fact with the remark that it is really no exception to his statement. But this is not argument.

Canon Streeter was so troubled by the presence of this title in an Epistle attributed to St. Peter, that he got over the difficulty by attributing the Epistle to Aristion, " frankly as a guess, but, I hope, a scientific guess." (*The Primitive Church*, p. 130).

No better example could be found of the way in which Modern Historical Criticism deals with its materials. When they interfere with its theories, all evidence is set on one side and a guess is substituted for it which, it is devoutly hoped, may be " scientific."

The word " Elder " is really quite a neutral word and takes its meaning from its context. In its derivation it simply means " an old man." It is used freely in the Old Testament of the Elders of the Israelites.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews uses it, without qualification, of the ancient worthies of Israel. (Heb., xi, 2).

In the rest of the New Testament it is used of the Elders of the Jews and of the officials who were appointed by the Apostles in Jerusalem as well as in the rest of the churches which they founded.

By the time that the Pastoral Epistles were written this meaning was well established and there is no reason to think that it was widened later on to include ALL members of the generation which succeeded to the Apostles, as Dr Bernard would have us believe.

When he is dealing with the usage of Irenaeus, he says that the word means those

> " who whether officially or unofficially had succeeded to the position of leadership which the Apostles held." (*op. cit.* p. xlvi).

But when he is dealing with Papias, he says that the word means "Christians of the second generation," without producing any evidence in support of his opinion.

As we have seen, the word generally means official ministers of the Church in the New Testament. Dr Bernard has not quoted a single passage from Irenaeus where this use of the word would not be applicable. In his comment on the well-known passage in Papias Eusebius apparently equates the expressions "the words of the Elders" and "the words of the Apostles." (*H.E.*, iii, 39). We do not wish to lay stress on this argument, but we do want to insist that there is no evidence at all for taking the word "Elder" as a technical term used by writers of the second century to denote all Christians of the second generation, without any idea of official position being attached to it.

Dr Bernard, however, imperatively requires this interpretation of the word to support his theory that a man who calls himself "John the Elder" *must* belong to the second generation of Christians and *cannot* be the Apostle. But his idea does not explain why Papias distinguishes him from Aristion by this title, or why both he and Aristion are said to have been "disciples of the Lord." It would seem as if there was something honourable and official about the title Elder in the writings of Papias.

If John the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse and was willing to describe himself there as "John your brother," it does not seem impossible that, in a place where he was the chief of all the official ministers of the Church, he should have described himself in private letters as "the Elder," especially as he seems to have preferred to speak of himself by an impersonal title.

Dr Bernard admits that Irenaeus accepted the Second Epistle of John as the work of the Apostle (*op. cit.* p. xlix).

From this it follows that *he* saw nothing incongruous in its writer calling himself an Elder, although he was an Apostle.

Who is likely to be the best judge as to the usage of

this word in the second century, Irenaeus, or a twentieth century critic ?

We have thus shown that the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel cannot be shown to be impossible by the fact that the author of the Second Epistle of St. John calls himself " the Elder."

Those who believe that the Apostle was only indirectly the author of the Gospel and that it was really the work of a disciple who put his recollections into shape are always confronted with the difficulty that in the last verse of the Gospel it is categorically stated by certain unknown witnesses that the Beloved Disciple was he who witnesseth about these things and who *wrote* these things.

Harnack regards this verse as possibly a deliberate falsehood and Canon Streeter considers that it was added " at a later date and in another locality," because certain persons did not accept the Gospel as the work of the Apostle John or of any other reliable witness. (*The Four Gospels*, p. 430).

Dr Bernard's explanation of this difficulty is more subtle. He allows that the expression " witnesseth " may imply that the Apostle was alive when these words were written and that the words " these things " probably refer to the whole content of the Gospel.

He then adds,

> " ὁ γράψας ταῦτα: *prima facie*, this indicates that the Beloved Disciple actually wrote the Gospel with his own hand including the appendix, and not only that his reminiscences are behind it. But γράφειν is sometimes used when dictation only is intended ; *e.g.*, ' Pilate wrote a title and put it on the cross ' (John, xix, 19) means that Pilate was responsible for the wording of the titulus, but hardly that he himself wrote on the wooden board. So Paul says " I write the more boldly to you " (Rom., xv, 15), while it appears from Rom., xvi, 22, that the scribe of the Epistle was one Tertius. *Cf.*, Gal. vi, 11 and I Pet., v, 12, " . . . The Elders of the Church certified that the Beloved Disciple caused these things

to be written. *They were put into shape* by the writer who took them down and afterwards published them, not as his own, but as the Gospel according to John" (*op. cit.* p. 713). (*Italics* ours).

It is to be observed that the examples which Dr Bernard takes to establish his contention that γράφειν can mean "dictate" are examples where the context suggests and justifies this interpretation, with the exception of Gal., vi, 11 where the word seems to mean "to write" in the strictest sense of the word and is generally taken in this sense.

In the case of the quotation about Pilate, where the context no more suggests that he wrote the titulus than that he put it on the cross personally, we are told in another verse that he identified the actual words written with his thoughts in the most emphatic manner.

We do not know that it has ever been believed that Tertius did more than take down the *exact words* which the Apostle Paul dictated to him.

Would Dr Bernard suggest that Rom., xvi, 22 implies that Tertius put the Epistle to the Romans into shape?

He tells us that the employment of scribes was very common, and there is no need to dispute this, but that the Apostle John used a scribe cannot be proved from this passage, still less can it be proved that this scribe was "The Elder John," who remains a shadowy personage, and who cannot be shown to have had any connection with Ephesus, even supposing that he ever existed. What we regret most of all to notice is that Dr Bernard, following a favourite and completely fallacious method of "criticism," at first only suggests that the Apostle used an amanuensis to take down what he dictated (an opinion which has no practical consequences, however unfounded it may be) and then expands this suggestion into something quite different.

First he says that the elders of the Church certified that John had "caused these things to be written," and then that "they were put into shape by the writer that took them down."

He has already assumed that " John the Elder " was the author of the Second Epistle and that, on grounds of similarity of style the same writer must be the author of the First Epistle and the Gospel.

So we arrive at the result that the Apostle was the " witness " behind the Gospel and that the " Elder " was decidedly more than an amanuensis.

The Elder John, that mysterious personage about whom no Church writer but Papias tells us anything and whose very existence was unsuspected until Eusebius was looking for a suitable author for the Apocalypse, is brought to Ephesus and made to be responsible at least for the style of the Gospel. Now this style is so distinctive and so obviously the production of a remarkable personality, that we can hardly doubt that a man who could write like this must have interposed a good deal of his personality between the Apostle and the readers of the Gospel.

It is strange that a writer like Dr Bernard, who has parted company with the generality of modern critics in seeing the witness of an Apostle behind the Gospel and much that is historical in it, should so twist the meaning of a plain and ordinary word in order to interpolate another mind between the " witness " and his readers.

The same phenomenon is observable in the works of Dr Stanton.

In the first volume of his *Historical character of the Gospels* he attributed the Fourth Gospel directly to the Apostle John.

In the third volume, published 17 years afterwards, he wrote of the verse which we have been considering that there was reason to think that the last chapter was written after the death of the Apostle, and, in this case, the expression " witnesseth about these things " must be intended to mean that the " testimony enshrined in the book was a living testimony."

He then adds,

> " It is further said of the disciple in question that he ' wrote these things.' ' These things ' can here, at any

rate, only refer to the preceding twenty chapters, if the Appendix was written after his death."

He then asks what exact meaning and force is to be assigned to this statement, and says,

"We observe first a certain want of precision therein: he says 'these things,' not 'this book.' Further the words 'and wrote these things' seem to be added as a kind of after-thought. More prominence, at all events, is given to his having borne witness. From the position and form of this reference to writing it is not unfair to infer that there may have been some uncertainty in the mind of the framer of this statement as to the extent as to which it was to be attributed to the same disciple" (*op. cit.* Vol. III, p. 133).

Dr Stanton does not seem to have thought of the explanation which Dr Bernard gives of this verse. Instead of this he resorts to the desperate expedient of suggesting that the words "these things" lack precision.

It is strange that so good a scholar did not remember how many statements in Greek and Latin "lack precision" in this sense.

Nothing is more common in these languages than the use of the pronouns τα῀υτα and "haec" in which the reader is left to gather their exact meaning from the context. English authors are generally more explicit, but their usage in no way justifies the interpretation of this passage which Dr Stanton suggests.

The argument that the words "and wrote these things" are added as a kind of afterthought is extremely feeble.

The words are in a perfectly logical order and none of them is superfluous. The disciple bears witness still to the things written in this book and he has written them down.

As far as we know none of the many critics to whose theories this text is an obstruction has adopted Dr Stanton's theory as to its meaning. We only cite the explanations of it given by these two writers as an extraordinary example of the influence of environment on two sober and reasonable critics whose theories do not compel them to deny the

apostolic authorship or the historical character of the Gospel at all costs.

Dr Garvie is a more radical critic. In his commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the *Abingdon Bible* he expresses his opinion that the last chapter, which he calls the Appendix, is by the hand of a redactor and was written partly to claim for St. Peter that position of authority (which is supposed to have been insufficiently recognized in the rest of the Gospel) by telling the story of his meeting with the Lord in Galilee and his restoration to office, which is *supposed*, without the least evidence, to have been also contained in the presumed lost ending to St. Mark's Gospel.

Dr Bacon and Canon Streeter hold generally similar views about this chapter, but Father de Grandmaison states that the only critic of weight in modern times who attributes this chapter to a redactor is Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfaenge*, I, p. 315, 1921 edition) in spite of a few other critics " most of whom are newcomers in the field of exegesis." (*Jesus Christ*, Vol. I, p. 143). It is, he says, found in all manuscripts and in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian and the fact that it is an appendix is in no way concealed.

The explanation which Dr Garvie gives for the production of this Appendix is singularly unconvincing. If its writer desired to glorify St. Peter, why did he represent him as showing his old spirit of indiscreet curiosity and being rebuked for it immediately after his restoration to the Apostolate ? This incident is quite in keeping with the character of St. Peter as described in the Synoptic Gospels and this renders it probable that the story is true. But if it is to be regarded as an imaginary addition to the Gospel by a redactor, its presence and character are inexplicable. This explanation of the purpose of the chapter is not original, but Dr Garvie has something new to follow. He says that the enquiry about the end of the Beloved Disciple and the answer " If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ? " is not an explanation of a story which was prevalent that this Disciple should remain on earth until the Lord came again, but an attempt to explain Mark, ix, 1,

> " Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand by who shall in no wise taste of death until they see the Kingdom of God come with power."

He thinks that this was understood as a promise that *one* at least of the Twelve should survive until the Second Coming. If the Beloved Disciple was identified with the son of Zebedee, and was thus reckoned as the last survivor of the Twelve, his death would cause widespread bewilderment (*op. cit.* p. 1,036).

Canon Streeter and some other commentators are content to believe that the Appendix was written to explain some such supposed saying of Jesus as that reported in it, namely, that the Beloved Disciple might tarry until Christ came again. There is no doubt that they are right, for the author, in true Johannine style, writes,

> " This saying, *therefore*, went out among the brethren that this disciple should not die."

This plainly shows that the expectation had been connected with the saying of the Lord just mentioned. Tertullian interpreted the passage in this way (*De Anima L*). Dr Garvie's introduction of a reference to Mark, ix, 1 is therefore, quite uncalled for.

It is interesting to see that he rejects the explanations of the words γράφειν and ταῦτα given by Dr Bernard and Dr Stanton. He says,

> " The first part of verse 24 asserts the redactor's belief that the Beloved Disciple was the author of the whole Gospel."

Yet he cannot bring himself to admit that the Gospel was attributed to the Apostle at so early a date without some hesitation.

He says,

> " The intention of verse 24 is to identify the author of the Gospel with the Apostle John, since the sons of Zebedee are mentioned in verse 2, although there is not a word in the Gospel to support such a contention, and even the Appendix does not make the identification inevitable, since two other of his disciples are mentioned.

> The tradition of authorship which afterwards became common was evidently still challenged when this attestation of quite unknown authorship was added, affording us unintentioned evidence that the authorship was in doubt. If verse 24 is not an added note, but belongs to the Appendix, as originally written, then the attempt to settle a disputed question must be regarded as one of the reasons for the Appendix" (*op. cit.* p. 1,063).

Let us see what follows from this. If verse 24 was an addition to the Appendix it was very fortunate for the man who added it that the unknown author of the rest of the Appendix thought of mentioning these unnamed disciples at verse 2. If verse 24 was part of the Appendix, we can only suppose that the writer of it mentioned these unknown persons in order to afford himself a means of escape, if any one who knew that John was not the Beloved Disciple (as Dr Garvie believes) pressed him too hard.

Again if verse 24 was an addition to the Appendix, we might still suppose, in accordance with what is supposed by a certain school of critics to have been the way in which the Gospels were written, that it was "not impossible" that the person who added this verse to the Appendix also inserted the mention of these two persons into the body of the Appendix to serve his own purposes. That these ingenious conjectures are supported by no manuscript evidence whatever will cause no difficulty to that particular type of critic to whom theories are of far more importance than dull facts.

At any rate the writer of verse 24 must have been a person endowed with no common mental subtlety.

He knew (*ex hypothesi*) that the authorship of the Gospel was in doubt, but that people were inclined to believe that it had been written by the Apostle John who was also the Beloved Disciple.

What he believed himself we do not know, but he framed his statement in such a way as to seem to imply that the son of Zebedee was the author of the Gospel, while at the same time he left himself a loophole of escape

by mentioning or taking advantage of the mention by the first Redactor of two unnamed disciples among the members of the party who went to fish in the lake. Certainly whoever did this (whether it was done by the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, as is generally believed, or by some unknown genius, as Dr Garvie appears to assume), he was a man who, in becoming a Christian, had lost none of his Greek cunning.

So from this excursion into " the pasturelands of speculation " Dr Garvie comes back with the discovery that the fact that two unnamed persons are mentioned in Chapter XXI affords unintentioned evidence that, when this Appendix was written, the apostolic authorship of the Gospel was still challenged.

The real facts are these :—there is no evidence worth mentioning that the Appendix (with the exception of the last two verses) was not written by the author of the rest of the Gospel: even Canon Streeter partly admits this. Dr Garvie himself has to admit that the tradition that the Gospel was written by the Apostle " afterwards became common." If he had said that it afterwards became universal, he would have been nearer the facts.

He also admits that the people who wrote the last two verses of the Appendix believed this tradition, or else wished to produce a belief in it and actually succeeded in producing it so successfully that the apostolic authorship was never seriously questioned until the eighteenth century, and that their evidence on this point deceived Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, not to mention many other learned men.

This is the most elaborate but, at the same time, the weakest attempt that we have seen to torture this unfortunate verse into meaning what it plainly does not mean. The author of it may have been a downright liar, as many critics of note have been driven to suppose, but to imagine that he did his work in this equivocal manner, if he wished to settle the authorship of the Gospel, is improbable in the highest degree.

Dr Garvie's method of showing that the Apostle John

cannot have been the Beloved Disciple (which Canon Streeter admits) is drastic. He says,

> "The synoptic records show that John, the son of Zebedee, was indeed in the inner circle of the disciples, but not that he had either the moral character or the spiritual capacity to become the confidant of Jesus about his inner life, as the Fourth Gospel represents the Beloved Disciple to have been. When it is argued that the Son of Thunder was changed into the Apostle of Love by the lapse of many years, what is ignored is that the fitness for such intimacy with Jesus must have been shown during the earthly ministry" (*op. cit.* p. 1,065).

On this it must be remarked that John is nowhere represented as the "confidant of Jesus about his inner life," least of all in the Fourth Gospel. There our Lord is represented as giving his deepest teaching to all the disciples equally. In the Synoptic Gospels it is true that he is represented as taking *three* of his disciples with him on specially solemn occasions, but never as confiding anything to St. John alone.

There would be no great moral perversity in a young and ardent Galilean, steeped in Old Testament ideas, wishing to call down fire from heaven on those who rejected his Master, or to check those who he thought were abusing his Master's name. At any rate it has to be admitted that the son of Zebedee, in spite of his inferior moral character and lack of spiritual capacity, was one of the inner circle of the Twelve. It follows from this that the other Apostles must have been still less moral and spiritual.

This conclusion squares very ill with the prevalent theory that Jesus was a somewhat exceptional religious enthusiast, little in advance of his times, who taught scarcely any of the doctrine which we now regard as specifically Christian, and that it was the Apostles who founded the Christian Church, which Jesus had never thought of.

If a member of the inner circle of the Apostles was such an inferior type of person, it is difficult to see how those who were at an even lower moral and spiritual level did this

great work which must have needed, if not some "moral character" at least some power of spiritual receptivity.

If John the Son of Thunder possessed even this, we do not see why he should not have been developed into the Apostle of Love by his contact with the historical Jesus and by the influence of his Spirit, and we are quite unable to understand why he who ate with publicans and sinners may not have been also able to receive and even to love a young man whose only fault was his misguided affection for his master. To think that Jesus only associated with persons who were "fit" to be his associates is a strange misreading of his character and purpose.

Lastly it will be well to consider two extreme pronouncements with regard to the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel.

The Rev. R. G. Griffith who is the editor of the tracts lately published by the Modern Churchmen's Union to tell us what they believe has also written a book called *The Gospel History Examined.*

In this he informs us that conservatives will catch at any straw which may help them to retain the traditional belief that the Fourth Gospel was written by an Apostle (p. 9).

He does not make the slightest mention of the external evidence which exists for this attribution, so that his readers have no opportunity of seeing how tough some of these straws are and how much ingenuity such writers as Canon Streeter have had to exercise to get rid of their entangling presence. He adds that

> "Canon Streeter has surveyed the evidence and thinks that it points to an Elder named John who lived at Ephesus. Nowhere is it stated that the book is written by an Apostle except in the last two verses (xxi, 24, 25), *the authenticity of which is denied by Bishop Westcott.*" (Italics ours).

To the ordinary reader this means that Bishop Westcott considered that these verses made a false and unauthorized statement.

How far this is the truth anyone can see by referring to the Bishop's *Commentary.*

Mr Griffith then says that this is confirmed by the evidence of *Codex Siniaticus* " which omits the last verse to support the bishop." Even if this statement were true, it would help Mr Griffith's argument in no way whatever, for the important verse is not the last, but the last but one. The fact is that in the Codex Siniaticus the last verse is added in what Tischendorf considered to be another hand from that of the scribe who wrote the rest of the Manuscript, but in a hand which is found in the Apocrypha in the same Manuscript and in some corrections and scattered leaves. He considers that this scribe is the man who wrote the Vatican Manuscript which is at least of equal authority to Siniaticus.

Tragelles considered that the verse was written by the same scribe who wrote the rest of the Manuscript (Westcott, *Commentary on St. John*, Vol. II, p. 377).

Mr Griffith then says that Mark foretold a dire fate for the sons of Zebedee and that Papias has a tradition that the Apostle John died about A.D. 66 (*op. cit.* p. 10). There is not one word to indicate that this tradition is found only in a fragment of unknown authorship which may be the work of Philip of Side, a writer of a compendium of history in the fifth century, of whose accuracy his contemporaries had the poorest opinion, and in an interpolation in one manuscript of Georgius Hamartolus, a monk of the ninth century who almost certainly copied the statement from Philip. The date given, as if it were certainly stated by Papias, is the figment of an ingenious German brain.

The other paper which we wish to notice is an article by Professor Bacon in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1931. In this article the Professor demolishes all the evidence that there is supposed to be for the existence of an " Elder John of Ephesus." He believes that the person called the Elder John lived in Jerusalem and claims to have proved this in many books (p. 323). As he is compelled to believe that the Gospel was written by someone, he attributes it to an Unknown Elder of Ephesus.

This seems to be no great gain, but it enables him to

deride the half-Traditionalist writers who still cling to their "Ersatz-Johannes" (p. 312).

We gladly leave to them the defence of their lay-figure, whom Professor Bacon is disrespectful enough to refer to as "a higher-critical myth"—not the oldest of the family, we believe.

Dr Bacon says that "the authentic birth-place of the mythical Elder John" is to be found in Eusebius, which seems to be undeniable; but he need not have added the following,

> "The bright star of critical speculation has led us to the spot. Heaped on the altar still lie the gold of Zahn, the frankincense of Harnack and the myrrh of Gutjahr. It were well to pause in mysti ccontemplation." (p. 321).

After reading this we are not surprised that this writer should refer to the "boastful and sophisticated claims of Irenaeus" and to his "exaggerations and misrepresentations" and say that for him

> "Polycarp and Papias must be both his (John's) direct disciples and appointees, because, forsooth, Irenaeus could remember from his growing boyhood stories publicly related by Polycarp as from 'John' about sayings and mighty works of the Lord" (p. 322).

Nor are we astonished when we read,

> "A well-considered verdict compells us to state that the much desired cap-stone to the theory of Dionysius is a higher-critical mare's nest of the purest breed" (pp. 321, 322).

We are not so much touched by the good taste and elegance of the style of this article as by the recklessness with which the writer of it brings charges of untruthfulness against a man who occupied an honourable position when he was alive, and who is no longer here to defend himself. This is the pit into which all extreme critics of the Fourth Gospel seem at last to fall[1]: the weakness of the case

[1] Both Heitmuller and Schwartz accuse Irenaeus of having invented the figure of the ancient Apostle John at Ephesus. De Grandmaison, Jesus Christ, Vol. I., p. 132, English Trans.

which they put forward can best be judged by their recourse to such methods.

It is often insisted on in critical books that the Bible must be treated like any other book, and to this we agree.

But when critics try to make the simplest and most ordinary words like γράφειν mean what they desire them to mean, and not what they commonly mean, as Dr Bernard does, or when they found a theory which is contrary to the tradition of the whole Church on the fact that τᾶντα has not an absolutely certain meaning in a passage where its meaning is obvious enough, as Dr Stanton does, this is not treating the Bible like any other book. Still less is the treatment which Dr Garvie metes out to the last chapter of the Fourth Gospel the sort of thing that we meet in the criticism of any other book than the Bible.

Mr Griffith misrepresents the opinion of Bishop Westcott on the last verses of the Gospel and the manuscript evidence for the last verse, and quotes as undoubtedly the statement of Papias a statement which many good scholars regard as a stupid mistake of a fifth century bungler, and adds to it a date for which Papias, even in this supposed quotation, had no responsibility.

Professor Bacon proves to his own satisfaction that the person to whom these authors ascribe the Gospel is a myth, and dismisses all the external evidence for its authorship by the Apostle John on the ground that, in his opinion, a highly respected bishop of the second century was a liar and a charlatan.

What can be the value of a theory which rests on "evidence" like this?

Canon Raven, in his recent book, has given good reasons for regarding the Fourth Gospel as the work of an eye-witness, who may well have been the Apostle John. We can only hope that the bankruptcy of the contrary type of criticism which we have noted above may do something in a negative direction to enforce the strong positive arguments which he brings forward.

H. P. V. Nunn

Art. VI.—RICHARD PORSON (1759-1808)

1. *Letters to Travis.* By R. Porson. (London. 1790).
2. *Tracts.* By R. Porson. Edited by Kidd. (London. 1815).
3. *Literary Anecdotes.* By E. H. Barker. (London. 1852).
4. *Table Talk of S. Rogers.* Edited by Dyce and Maltby. (London. 1856).
5. *Cambridge Essays.* By H. R. Luard. (London. 1857).
6. *Life of Porson.* By J. Selby Watson. (London. 1861).
7. *Porson.* By R. C. Jebb. DNB.

Porson is a minor English legend, less familiar than Robin Hood or King Alfred or Dr Johnson, but in the same company. He is more than an academic character like Calverley or Pater. His mind touches bigger interests. He represents the best of the English eighteenth century in the unexpected disguise of a scholar. Intellect and wit seem only a part of him. He gives the impression of a great capacity for affairs and a sound common-sense. It is true that he never used his powers. But there must be something to explain the discrepancy between the legendary man and the actual insignificance of his achievements. Sherlock Holmes assured his admirers that the real genius of the family was his brother Mycroft, *nominis umbra* hidden in a Government office. Porson was one of the Mycrofts of this world, paralyzed for public achievement by indolence or conscience or drink or whatever it was. But he has left behind the flavour of a personality.

Probably few, if any, turn to-day to Porson's published volumes. Even among theologians the argument against the authenticity of I John, v, 7, which is the subject of the

Letters to Travis, is taken as read. It is to the man himself we turn. Rogers' *Table Talk* takes the place of Mrs Piozzi to this Johnson, but there is no Boswell. We have to be satisfied with the industrious Selby Watson, later to be tried for the murder of his wife and to die in an asylum.

Who was Porson ? He said himself that he would be satisfied if three hundred years after his day it should be said that " one Porson lived towards the close of the eighteenth century, who did a good deal for the text of Euripides." Richard Porson was born on Christmas Day, 1759, at East Ruston near North Walsham in Norfolk, the son of Huggins Porson, parish clerk and weaver, the second of a family of four, the eldest being the only daughter, and all of them having a touch of genius. His mother was the daughter of Thomas Palmer, a shoemaker of Bacton. To her the genius of the family is usually traced. She had been in service at the vicarage and had caught there a taste for reading, which she encouraged in her children. At the village schools of Bacton and Happisburgh Richard distinguished himself in arithmetic and was reputed a first-rate performer at marbles and trap-ball. His destination was the hand-loom of his father's cottage, but at the age of eleven he found a friend in the curate of East Ruston. This man, by name Hewitt, had a natural gift ; he trained his own five sons for the University so successfully that four of them gained fellowships. Through the offices of Hewitt, Porson was brought to the notice of Norris, the squire of Witton Park (four miles from Ruston), the founder of the Norrisian Professorship at Cambridge. Norris preferred to send the boy to school. Having had him examined by Lambert, Greek Professor at Cambridge, and being satisfied with the report, he tried to secure a nomination to Charterhouse. Failing there, he collected a fund and got the boy entered at Eton in August, 1774.

Measured by the standards of a hundred and fifty years later, Porson was well above the average, but by no means a youthful prodigy. At thirteen he had read a good deal in the simpler Latin writers, Terence, Ovid, Cæsar, the

Eclogues and *Georgics* of Vergil, and the *Colloquies* of Erasmus. He is described as proficient in mathematics, but had "only reached Greek verbs," which probably means that he had not begun to read Greek authors. He was fifteen when he went to Eton and was not thought equal to a reputation that had gone before him. He won appreciation chiefly for a remarkable memory. On one occasion having brought into class a translation of Ovid in mistake for a text of Horace he correctly construed the ode from memory. He continued such feats throughout his life. He could repeat pages of books he had read but once and could repeat them even backwards. Once when asked the meaning of a word in Thucydides he recited the whole passage and said,

> "The word occurs only twice in Thucydides, once on the right hand page of the edition you are using and once on the left. I observed on which side you looked and so recognized the passage."

It was a common sight to see him in his later years, when in his cups, standing in the street reciting Homer. Jebb quotes him as explaining the readiness of his memory as due to the training of intense labour; he declared that to impress a point upon his mind he would read a passage a dozen times and transcribe it six. In this way practice had produced an abnormal facility. He boasted that he could get the whole *Morning Chronicle* by heart in a week.

The Eton opinion of him was that his Greek and his industry were both indifferent. He did, however, write and produce an English play *Out of the Frying-pan into the Fire*, the hero of which was Dr Faustus. Porson himself took the buffoon's part of Punch, servant to Faustus, a part which he continued to play in real life. Little record of his Eton career survives. One of the few contemporaries of whom his opinion is preserved was the notable Evangelical Charles Simeon. It is a foretaste of Porson's temper that he dwells on Simeon's ugliness, and still more so the later description he gave of Simeon, "a coxcomb in religion."

In 1777 his patron Norris died. His place was taken by the physician Sir George Baker. Porson had probably

entered Eton too late to follow the normal course of going to King's College, Cambridge, as an Eton Scholar. He entered Trinity as a commoner in October, 1778. At Cambridge he came into his own. He was made scholar of Trinity in 1780 and Craven scholar in 1781. The Classical Tripos did not exist and Porson took his degree as third Senior Optime in 1782, there being eighteen wranglers. He was given the first Chancellor's medal, which was equivalent to the first place in classics. Trinity immediately elected him Fellow (Oct. 1782) contrary to the custom which excluded junior bachelors from fellowships.

Thirty years before Gibbon had found that at Oxford "the dull and deep potations" of the Fellows of Magdalen had excused "the brisk intemperance of youth." Porson may not have had the same model but he reached the same end. His reputation fell. He associated with undergraduates to the disgust of the Fellows and conducted his arguments with the poker. Twenty years later Byron saw him in Cambridge and gave one of the least flattering of all the surviving pictures:

> "I remember to have seen Porson at Cambridge, in the hall of our college, and in private parties, but not frequently; and I never can recollect him except as drunk or brutal, and generally both; I mean in an evening, for in the hall he dined at the Dean's table, and I at the Vice-master's, so that I was not near him; and he then and there appeared sober in his demeanour, nor did I ever hear of excess or outrage on his part in public—commons, college, or chapel; but I have seen him in a private party of undergraduates, many of them fresh men and strangers, take up a poker to one of them, and heard him use language as blackguard as his action. I have seen Sheridan drunk, too, with all the world; but his intoxication was that of Bacchus, and Porson's that of Silenus. Of all the disgusting brutes, sulky, abusive, and intolerable, Porson was the most bestial, as far as the few times I saw him went. . . . I saw him once go away in a rage, because nobody knew the name

> of the 'Cobbler of Messina,' insulting their ignorance with the most vulgar terms of reprobation. He was tolerated in this state amongst the young men for his talents. . . . He used to recite, or rather vomit, pages of all languages, and could hiccup Greek like a Helot; and certainly Sparta never shocked her children with a grosser exhibition than this man's intoxication. I perceive, in the book you sent me, a long account of him, which is very savage.[1] I cannot judge, as I never saw him sober, except in hall or combination-room; and then I was never near enough to hear, and hardly to see him." (Byron to Murray, Feb. 20th, 1818).

Byron's opinion of his fellow-men is never good evidence. Lady Blessington said that it was enough to raise his bile to praise any one in his presence.[2] Still Porson provoked persistent dislike. Sir Samuel Brydges, a Cambridge contemporary, found him a disagreeable companion.[3] A glance at his portrait gives confirmation. It is a sulky face with a marked touch of malice. His vindictive temper must be what is hinted at in a mysterious sentence of Kidd, the editor of Porson's *Tracts*:

> "He was prone to a spirit of intolerance which often discomposed his nights and he experienced great difficulty in mollifying and subduing this inclination."

He took offence easily and did not forgive. In his later life he never spoke to his early patron Baker. There was no quarrel but he resented something Baker had said either to him or about him. The only *bonhomie* of which Porson was capable was the sort that finds *in vino veritas*, unpleasant truth, and publishes it where it will be least welcome.

An acute and orderly mind and a disinterested love of truth was the equipment with which Porson entered on his life work. A reviewer in the *Museum Criticum* (believed

[1] The book was William Beloe, *The Sexagenarian*, London. 1817.

[2] Crabb Robinson, *Diary*, III, p. 17.

[3] *Autobiography*, I, p. 58.

to have been Blomfield, afterwards Bishop of London) said that Porson possessed

> " two qualities . . . essential requisites in the formation of a great character—an utter contempt for money and a religious attachment to truth."

He chose the field of classical scholarship. This meant at that time little beyond the textual criticism of Greek and Latin authors. It is possible to belittle such a career as a misuse of talents that might have been given to the larger interests of mankind. The truer criticism is to appreciate the accuracy and method which Porson developed and which has served to train and sharpen the intelligence of later generations. The passion of the scholarship of the day was for conjectural emendation of corrupt or uncorrupt passages. Porson established permanently the more rational method of collating a body of MSS. as the foundation principle for constructing a text. So novel was the obvious principle at the time that when he proposed to the University Press that he should go to Florence to collate the Medicean Aeschylus, one of the Syndics inquired why he could not *collect* his MSS. at home. The triumph of Porson's principles is seen in the *Letters* to Travis (1788–9) where he demonstrated with crushing finality that the verse in the first Epistle of St. John (I John, v, 7), describing the Trinity was a spurious interpolation. Porson did this so well that to-day it is almost forgotten that he ever did it. Hardly less acute, though less a subject of demonstration, was his conviction that the story of the adulterous woman in John, viii, was an interpolation, an opinion since confirmed by the discovery of *Codex Sinaiticus*.

His classical work was mainly in the fields of lexicography and Greek prosody ; he edited some plays of Euripides in a manner which Sandys called masterly, and wrote reviews on classical subjects for magazines. But it is no injustice to say that this gives no adequate idea of the man. Some of his casual remarks imply that he did not himself greatly value classical scholarship.

> "If I had a son," he is credited with saying, "I should endeavour to make him familiar with French and English authors rather than classics. Greek and Latin are only luxuries."

He called Greek and Latin verse composition "trash fit only to be put behind the fire." At Cambridge he is infelicitously commemorated by a prize for Greek iambics.

The incisive mind of the man is revealed best in his criticisms of English literature. The preface to the *Letters to Travis* contains a famous estimate of Gibbon :

> "An impartial judge, I think, must allow, that Mr Gibbon's *History* is one of the ablest performances of its kind that has ever appeared. His industry is indefatigable ; his accuracy scrupulous ; his reading, which indeed is sometimes ostentatiously displayed, immense ; his attention always awake; his memory retentive ; his style emphatic and expressive ; his periods harmonious. His reflections are often just and profound ; he pleads eloquently for the rights of mankind, and the duty of toleration ; nor does his humanity ever slumber, unless when women are ravished, or the Christians persecuted. Mr Gibbon shews, it is true, so strong a dislike to Christianity, as visibly disqualifies him for that society, of which he created Ammianus Marcellinus president. I confess that I see nothing wrong in Mr Gibbon's attack on Christianity. It proceeded, I doubt not, from the purest and most virtuous motive. We can only blame him for carrying on the attack in an insidious manner, and with improper weapons. He often makes, when he cannot readily find, an occasion to insult our religion ; which he hates so cordially, that he might seem to revenge some personal injury. Such is his eagerness in the cause, that he stoops to the most despicable pun, or to the most awkward perversion of language, for the pleasure of turning the Scripture into ribaldry, or of calling Jesus an impostor. Though his style is in general correct and elegant, he sometimes draws out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument. . . .

> Sometimes in his anxiety to vary his phrase, he becomes obscure. . . . Thus an honourable gentleman is often described by a circumlocution, lest the same word should be twice repeated in the same page. Sometimes epithets are added which the tenour of the sentence renders unnecessary. Sometimes in his attempts at elegance, he loses sight of English, and sometimes of sense . . . " (*op. cit.*, pp. xxviii sqq.).

No less true was the pungent *obiter dictum* that one of the best exercises for a schoolboy was to turn a page of Gibbon into English. It was Porson too who said that Southey would be read when Homer and Vergil were forgotten. One of the most remarkable examples of his critical insight was his deduction that Swift was the author of the *Tale of a Tub* which had been published anonymously. He inferred this from the following passages :

> " Fourscore and eleven Pamphlets have I writ under three reigns and for the Service of six and thirty factions." (*Tale of a Tub*, 1st ed., p. 51).

> " On each side of the Gate was a small window not above six inches from the ground : into that on the left side the King's smiths conveyed fourscore and eleven Chains like those that hang to a Lady's watch in Europe . . . which were lock'd to my left Leg with six and thirty Padlocks." (*Gulliver's Travels*, 1st ed., Vol. I, p. 22).

Few scholars were more widely read in all kinds of literature. He would sometimes read nothing but novels for a fortnight on end. He could repeat *Roderick Random* by heart. On the day of his marriage he was seen with a copy of the Rabelaisian satire *Le Moyen de Parvenir*, and called out, " These are the sort of books to buy."

In some ways Porson's concern with theology is the most significant feature of his career. A rather narrow Orthodox churchmanship held the field. Porson's fellowship required him to take Holy Orders within ten years. He faced the situation and refused.

> "There are fellows," he said, "who go into the pulpit assuming everything and knowing nothing, but I would not do so."

His scruples cost him his fellowship. On June 21st, 1792 he was forced to resign, the Master of Trinity refusing to nominate him to a lay fellowship, preferring instead a relative. The honesty of the *Letters to Travis* had already cost Porson the bulk of a legacy in the will of a wealthy lady named Mrs Turner; for understanding the *Letters* to be an attack on Christianity, she cut down his legacy from £300 to £30. What exactly his theological ideas were he never appears to have divulged. His contempt for orthodox divines is obvious in the well-known epigram:

> Here lies a Doctor of Divinity;
> He was a Fellow too of Trinity.
> He knew as much about Divinity
> As other Fellows do of Trinity.

A friend pointing to a passing buggy with three passengers suggested that it was an illustration of the Trinity. "No," said Porson, "it would need to be one man in three buggies." Is it a fanciful inference from these two mots and from his great interest in the Trinitarian interpolation in the Epistle of St. John that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was the root of his difficulty?

Just before the period when Porson went up to Cambridge the Church of England had been greatly excited by an agitation to secure relief from subscription to the Prayer Book and Articles of Religion for the clergy, the members of the Universities, and others who were required to subscribe. Archdeacon Blackburne's *Confessional* in 1766 advocated complete relief from subscription. A society was formed at the Feathers' Tavern to press for the abolition of subscription. It numbered among its supporters one of the greatest of the English bishops of the day, Edmund Law of Carlisle. Parliament refused to receive the Petition presented by the Society in 1772 but the interest did not perish immediately. It was a Cambridge movement. In the front line of its supporters were leading Cambridge men like Paley, Jebb,

and John Law. In 1780 Porson could still have felt the backwash of this movement. The history of this agitation has fallen into comparative obscurity. Its ostensible aim was to reduce the burden laid upon the clerical conscience by subscription to the Articles in the phraseology then used :

> " I acknowledge *all and every* the Articles . . . to be agreeable to the Word of God."[1]

But opponents of the agitation like Jones of Nayland believed that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was the real difficulty. This was probably true. But familiar as we are to-day with elastic interpretation of formularies and the idea of general assent, we can hardly realize the rigidity of eighteenth century orthodoxy or the narrowness of the unmodified form of assent. Porson's sympathies were probably with the less orthodox and more deistical of the petitioners, for one of his favourite books was *A Cordial for Low Spirits*, a collection of Tracts by Thomas Gordon, the translator of Tacitus, a deistical journalist whose *Independent Whig* was an expression of anti-ecclesiastical bias, " dull and worthless trash," says Mark Pattison, but widely enough read to be a cause of great uneasiness to the famous Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man. Porson was clearly not a champion of orthodoxy but beyond that negative description of his religious opinions it is not possible to go.

At least his love of truth was disinterested and it drove him to face starvation. Having lost his Trinity fellowship, he lived for three weeks (according to Luard) or six (according to Selby Watson) on a single guinea. Then friends came to the rescue. Dr Raine of Charterhouse and Mr Cleaver Banks collected from discriminating friends and admirers, headed by Lord Fitzwilliam, a capital sum sufficient to bring in an annual income of £100. Porson refused the capital but accepted the interest, and on his death the original sum went

[1] In 1865 the form of assent was changed. The words " all and every " are omitted and the subscriber declares " the doctrine therein set forth " instead of the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer themselves to be " agreeable to the Word of God."

to found the Porson Prize and Scholarship at Cambridge. Besides Lord Fitzwilliam who gave 100 guineas, several notable names appear among the subscribers. Dr Charles Burney, the son of Johnson's friend, gave £50; Shute Barrington, Bishop of Durham, £50; Lord Spencer and William Windham £25 each; Horne Tooke and Dr Routh 10 guineas each. The names are known of some seventy subscribers of amounts ranging from £10 to 100 guineas.

Before the end of 1792 Porson was the successful candidate for the Cambridge Chair of Greek, for which no subscription to the Articles was required. This gave him only £40 a year. The Professorship however was practically a sinecure. Porson's offer of lectures was not encouraged. He merely went up to Cambridge when examination duty called.

In November, 1795, Porson married a widow, the sister of Perry, editor of the *Morning Chronicle*. The marriage was short, for Mrs Porson died in April, 1797. Porson's drunken habits increased. As long ago as 1790 he had disgraced himself at Dr Parr's. He was often so unkempt that servants refused him admission at friends' houses. Six pots of porter was his breakfast allowance, port and brandy his favourite liquors. He could sit up drinking night after night. "He could drink all night and spout all day," said one of his companions at his favourite haunt, the "Cider Cellar" in Maiden Lane.[1] He was more than a match for the seventeenth century Dutch scholar Heinsius who used to stagger home murmuring:

Sta pes, sta bone pes; sta pes ne labere, mi pes;
Sta pes aut lapides hi mihi lectus erunt.

His very wit ran to toping for its subject. The appearance of Pitt and Dundas drunk in the House of Commons gave him material for 101 indifferent epigrams, the best of which is:

When Billy P—— he scarce could stand,
"Help, help," he cried, and stretched his hand
To faithful Henry calling.

[1] Milman (*Life of Gibbon*, 1839, p. 310) says that his conversation as well as his habits disqualified him for the part of a moral and religious censor, whatever he implied by that.

Quoth Hal, " My friend, I'm sorry for't,
'Tis not my practice to support
A minister that's falling.

He celebrated his imaginary relations with Continental scholars in the same terms :

I went to Strassburg and got drunk
With that most learn'd Professor Brunck,
And then to Wortz and got more drunken
With the more learn'd Professor Ruhnken.

In 1806 he became comparatively affluent as Librarian of the London Institution (the London Library of the day) at a salary of £200 a year with a suite of rooms. How he performed his duty is seen in a letter addressed to him by the Directors :

" We only know you are our Librarian by seeing your name attached to the receipts for your salary."

He held the post for little more than two years. On September 10th, 1808, he was seized with an apoplectic fit in the Strand and was carried into the Workhouse in Castle Street, St. Martin's Lane. Nobody recognized him and his description was advertised in the papers. He made some sort of recovery and even returned to his rooms at the Institution, but he died on September 25th, being only in his forty-ninth year.

His reputation was very high for one so generally disliked and so barren in actual achievement. He suffered from asthma from boyhood and his drinking habits were a kind of disease. But even so the work he did was nothing for one endowed with so rapid and penetrating a mind. Why ? Various answers will be offered. Habitual drunkenness paralysed his powers. But his habitual drunkenness may have been only the result of his lack of occupation. He may have despised the life of a scholar ; he certainly had political interests. But the true reasons were probably his utter lack of ambition and his independence of spirit. The independent lover of truth is rarely popular. He is too indifferent to be given the opportunities which fall to lesser

men. Neither seeking favours nor giving them, he is useless to those with interests to serve. Porson despised both money and reputation. He was as free from ambition as from flattery. Few men have had so disinterested a love of truth.

All these qualities helped to make him enemies. His replies to criticism did not conciliate. He was an adept at making an opponent look foolish. Hermann's contention that a tribrach can stand in any place except the last in an iambic line produced from him the sardonic verses :

ὁ μετρικὸς ὁ σόφος ἄτοπα γέγραφε περὶ μέτρων,
ὁ μετρικὸς ἄμετρος ὁ σόφος ἄσοφος εγένετο

They were followed by the familiar gibe :

The Germans in Greek
Are sadly to seek,
Not five in five score
But ninety five more,
All save only Hermann—
And Hermann's a German.

But Hermann also received a serious criticism which Sandys says contained his finest work and made Hermann describe his critic as " vir magnae accurataeque doctrinae "[1] His remark on Wilkes' production of an edition of Theophrastus, in which the Greek was printed without breathings or accents, was " Pooh, like its editor—of no character." Bishop Porteus he persistently called Proteus as having changed from liberal to illiberal opinions. He was frequently rude to his victim's face. A Scotsman who asked him if Bentley was not a Scot, was told, " No, Bentley was a Greek scholar." To a fellow-guest at dinner (probably Isaac Disraeli) he said " It is not in the power of thought or words to express the contempt I have for you, Mr ——." Pretentious persons like the pedantic Gilbert Wakefield were lashed to fury by his sarcasm. Wakefield, who has been described by Dr Parr as uniting the simplicity of a child with the fortitude of a martyr (which Porson's biographer

[1] Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, p. 428.

translates, "He combined great folly with great obstinacy") said that Porson was devoid of every human affection. Wakefield had ventured to criticize Porson's edition of the *Hecuba* in print. It is said that Porson shortly afterwards was at a dinner party at which toasts were going round; a name accompanied by an appropriate sentence from Shakespeare was required from each of the guests in succession. Before Porson's turn came, he had disappeared beneath the table and was supposed to be insensible to what was going on. But when a toast was required of him, he staggered up and gave "Gilbert Wakefield! What's Hecuba to him or he to Hecuba?"[1]

That Porson chose to criticize by ridicule may be an unamiable quality but it does not lessen his critical power. Some examples have been quoted already. His attitude to the Ireland forgeries was characteristic. Ireland invented some MSS. which he claimed were the work of Shakespeare. Many prominent people expressed their belief in the discovery. Porson's only comment when invited to sign a testimonial to Ireland was to say that he was always very slow to subscribe to articles of Faith and to publish a Greek version of "Three Children sliding on the ice" in the *Morning Chronicle*, with a covering letter signed S. England, expressing the opinion that the lines were from a lost play of Sophocles.

A huge number of rhymes and mots have been ascribed to Porson. The following are typical. A certain Dr Brocklesby remonstrated with Porson for calling him Rock. 'My name is Brock-les-by." "Well," said Porson, "if Brock less B isn't Rock, I know nothing of algebra." A charade:

> My first is the lot that is destin'd by fate
> For my second to meet with in every state.
> My third is by many philosophers reckoned
> To bring very often my first to my second.
>
> (Woman).

[1] Crabb Robinson, *Diary*, I, p. 55.

Many of the best of these witticisms however are apocryphal. Among these may be classed the motto from Horace for a pair of breeches :

Quos et aquae subeunt et aurae. (*Od.*, III, 4-7).

So also the essay on the theme *An Brutus occiso Caesare bene fecit aut male fecit*, which summed up the situation in the sentence : *Nec bene fecit nec male fecit sed interfecit.* This was also attributed to Curran and probably was the work of neither.

Porson belongs to that class of men endeared to English ideas, the unprofessional practitioner, the man who appears to follow his profession as a side issue. Ultimately it is force of character that achieves this power and that English regard for the amateur is a subtle tribute to the value of character. Porson's wish to be remembered as one who did something for the text of Euripides is not his fate. He has several monuments. The Porson Prize and Scholarship preserve his memory at Cambridge as a Greek scholar as does the Porson Greek type which was copied from his transcripts of *Medea* and *Phoenissae*. In the ante-chapel at Trinity is his bust by Chantrey ; his portrait by Kirkley is in the dining room of Trinity Lodge, and, best of all, the portrait by Hoppner is in the Cambridge University Library. But he is remembered best as a character. Readers will go to find him not in Kidd's collection of his *Tracts* on classical subjects nor in the *Letters to Travis*, nor even in the DNB., but in Rogers' *Table Talk*, and in Barker's *Literary Anecdotes*. Jebb has summarized his life work :

> " For Cambridge and for England he became . . . the creator of that ideal of finished and exact verbal scholarship which prevailed for more than fifty years after his death."

But he really lives as a kind of bad-tempered Johnson who always had a pointed answer ready.

> " Mr Porson," said Dr Parr in the *British Critic*, " is a giant in literature, a prodigy of intellect." " What right," answered Porson, " has any man to tell the height of a man he cannot measure."

E. J. Martin.

THE CHURCHES OF EUROPE:

THE NATIONAL CHURCH OF THE NETHERLANDS.

I HAVE been asked to write on the "faith and order" of the "Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk," which is the National and formerly Established Church of the Netherlands, or as its official definition runs, "the Reformed Church in the Kingdom of the Netherlands."[1] It is also called the "Dutch Reformed Church," but other Dutch Reformed Churches exist both in Holland itself and in the Dutch Colonies, in South Africa, in America and in other places, where Dutch people have colonized. There is very little or no contact at all between these several Dutch Reformed Churches and they differ considerably in many respects.

The Dutch Reformed Church in the Netherlands lost its unity in the course of the nineteenth century owing to the separation of the so-called "Gereformeerde Kerken," "gereformeerd" being simply another word for "hervormd" (reformed). These churches separated partly in protest against what was looked upon as undue state-interference with the internal life of the Established Church, partly in protest against the spread of religious and theological liberalism. The members of these separated churches like to call themselves "Calvinists"; their theology is apart from Holy Scripture based on Calvin's "Institutio Christianae Religionis" and they hold strongly fundamentalist views on the authority and inspiration of the Bible. They have also an extremely Puritan form of liturgy. The first separation took place in 1834 and gave birth to what since 1869 is called the "Christian Reformed Church" with at present some 50,000 members.

More serious was the second separation in 1886, which gave birth to the "Reformed (Gereformeerde) Church" with at present some 600,000 members. In many ways it is a very vigorous church with very well-attended church-services. But unfortunately it tries to base its strength on an almost complete

[1] "Nederland" or "the Netherlands" is the official name of the kingdom and country; in English the name "Holland" is more often used.

isolation from other Christian churches and it keeps persistently aloof from any œcumenical movements whatsoever. Of late it has lost a small section of its members, who have more or less been forced to leave their church, as being found in opposition to its narrow fundamentalism. Instead of joining again the far more comprehensive National Church of the country, these members have created a small denomination of their own.

Apart from these separated churches there are in Holland small bodies of Lutherans (±100,000), Baptists (±75,000), Arminians or Remonstrants (±35,000) and Old-Catholics (±12,000). The majority of the Dutch people, however, belong either to the "Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk" with a little more than 3 million members, or to the Roman Catholic Church with nearly 3 million members.

It is the "Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk" that we are concerned with now. I think I may simply call it in English the Dutch Church. The origin and history of this Church as a separately organized ecclesiastical body is intricately intertwined with the origin of Dutch independence and with the history of the Dutch Commonwealth, which developed later on into the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Therefore the Dutch Church may rightly be looked upon as the National Church of the Dutch people and nation.

The Dutch Church claims to be the Reformed Church of Christ in the Netherlands, which means that it considers itself to be continuous and identical with the true Church of Christ, which has been from the beginning, in so far as this one Church has found a place also in the life of Dutch people.

On the one hand the Dutch Church strongly insists on its being a very real and, to all intents and purposes, a fully loyal part of the One Holy Catholic Church. It does not want to be anything less, and it is very conscious of the fact that this is the sole basis of its existence as a church.

On the other hand, the Dutch Church strongly insists on its being a definitely national expression of the Christian Church. It is one of its convictions that the Church of Christ must of necessity manifest itself on earth under a great variety of national forms owing to the plain fact, that the differences between the nations of the world are very real differences, not only of language and other ways of expression, but also of God-given tasks and aims, which often have a tradition and history of centuries behind them.

The Dutch Church looks upon the Church of Rome as a church which is no less a national expression of Christianity than any of the other national churches in the world, because it has always been dominated by the Roman or Latin spirit. When, however, the Church of Rome is protested against, it is mainly because it has evidently erred in matters of faith at well as of order, and because it has refused to be reformed, when in the time of the Reformation the Spirit of God visited the Church in order to correct and rebuild it.

It was mainly in opposition to the Church of Rome that the Reformed Churches and among them also the Dutch Church described the true Church of Christ as

> " a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance,"

or as the Anglican Liturgy has it in its Prayer of Thanksgiving after Holy Communion when the Church is called

> " the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

In this, as in so many other beautiful prayers and admonitions of the Liturgy of Holy Communion and the Book of Common Prayer, expression is given to the fundamental beliefs of the Reformed churches in a more prayerful and adequate way than in many of the Articles of Religion of the different churches, which rightly have been characterized as " Articles of division."

It is because the Unity of the Church lies anchored in the One Faith in Jesus Christ as the One Lord and Saviour of the world sent and given by the One God and Father of all, that the Reformed Churches and among them the Dutch Church did not find it difficult to admit that

> " it is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one and utterly like,"

provided that private judgment should be submitted to lawful authority and all things should be done orderly and to edifying. The Reformed Churches have tried to maintain their rights and convictions in fighting against two opposite enemies: on the one hand against a type of Christianity which refused to be corrected by the Word of God, and on the other hand against sectarianism which so often is a consequence of undue predomination of private judgment. The great Reformed Churches were at the same time national churches and as such not only the English but also the Dutch Church has always tried " to keep the mean between two extremes."

In the time of the Reformation and for a considerable time afterwards, intercommunion between the great national churches was looked upon as a matter of course. The differences were accepted as national and often necessary differences in liturgy and organization within the one Church of Christ. Because of the great stress laid on the unity and catholicity of the Church it was considered as of the utmost importance that by frequent correspondence between theologians and official representatives of the different churches this unity should be made a practical reality.

When at the Synod of Dordrecht in 1618-19 the foundations of the Dutch Church were laid no decisions were made on any subject before the advice being asked of the several representatives of foreign churches, who were present. In every case first the advice was asked of the important delegation, which had been sent by the Church of England, and which was headed by the Bishop of Llandaff. Here follows one of its declarations :

> "*Declarunt clarissimi Magnae Britanniae Theologi se Confessionem Belgicam diligenter examinasse, nihilque in ea deprehendisse quod ad fidei quidem dogmata attineret, quod verbo Dei non consentiret.*" (Sessione 145).

We can be sure that the declarations of the Anglican delegation were based on the teaching of the Church of England, and as this teaching is fundamentally the same now as in the time of the Reformation the declaration, which I have quoted just now, contains the basis for a renewed understanding between the two national churches of England and Holland.

It is evident that in those days the Church of England no less than the Dutch Church refused to look upon a difference in the form of church-government as upon an obstacle to intercommunion and fellowship. A valid ministry was every ministry which was called, tried, examined and ordained according to the rules and regulations of the respective churches. In the Dutch Church the ministers have always been ordained to their holy functions by public prayer and with imposition of hands, and no one has ever been admitted to the ministration of the Holy Sacraments except after ordination according to the form and manner, which is customary and valid in the Dutch Church.

The form and manner of ordination in the Dutch Church is different from that in the English Church, but this does not prevent the Dutch Church from acknowledging ministers of episcopal churches as true ministers of God's Word and of the

Holy Sacraments so long as they have been validly ordained according to the rule of their own respective church. In the English Church a valid ordination means episcopal ordination; in the Dutch Church a presbyterian ordination is looked upon as valid. I think it is a principle on which all Reformed Churches do agree, that any form of ordination which is valid according to the rule of the respective church should be acknowledged as such by the other churches, so long as the form of ordination with prayer and impositions of hands intends to confer Christ's commission to preach the Gospel and to administer the Holy Sacraments on lawfully called, examined and appointed ministers. It is considered to be one of the errors of the Church of Rome when she identifies the reality of Christ's commission with a particular form of ordination and church-government. This false identification, which is considered to be contrary to the spirit of the teaching of Christ, is at the bottom of the unjust claims from the side of the Roman Church, against which the Reformed Churches will always continue to protest. But for the same reason the Dutch Church would feel bound to protest against any other Church or Church-party which might fall in the error of the same false identification whether on the episcopal or on the presbyterian side. For the Dutch Church does not believe that any form of church-government has exclusive Scriptural authority behind it, and therefore it does not look up on any difference in matters like these as upon a justifiable hindrance to intercommunion.

This does not mean, that the Dutch Church is fully satisfied with its form of church-government nor with its other features which are largely an heritage from by-gone ages. As a matter of fact very many of its members feel very unsatisfied with the present structure of the church, with its official dogmatic formularies and with the liturgy and life of the Church.

The official documents of the Church bear the marks of the one-sided stress which the Reformed Church in its transitional period of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth century was apt to lay on the newly-discovered reformation-principles. Although the Dutch Church has always refused to narrow down its faith and character by calling itself the Church of Calvin or even the Protestant Church its dogmatic and liturgical formularies are unmistakably imbued with a sound and moderate Calvinism. I venture to say that the same is true not only of the 39 Articles but also of large and very important parts of the

Book of Common Prayer of the English Church, particularly of its so-called exhortations, its general confessions, the " prayer of humbleness " and the prayer of thanksgiving after Holy Communion.

As every living church, the Dutch Church has been more than once brought to new life by sudden revivals or more lasting movements. The latitudinarian and methodist movements from England have greatly affected the life and teaching of the church ; from Germany Pietism, Kantianism and Ritschlianism spread into the Dutch Church, and also Liberal Protestantism. It is very widely felt that the official documents can no longer be looked upon as adequate expressions of the teaching and life of the Church. The Dutch Church is far more comprehensive than its official documents would probably make us surmise. It is not nearly so comprehensive as the English Church is, but its comprehensiveness is widening especially at present owing to œcumenical, liturgical, or what one might call " catholic " movements ; " catholic " being taken in the sense of St. Vincent of Lerius's maxim : *curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est;* this Latin type of catholicism, however, being quickened to new life by the faith and temper of the great reformers of the Christian Church. It is the spirit of men like the late Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, which is alive in this new catholic movement, although some of its leaders are even more deeply influenced by the wide catholicism of the Anglican Communion. It is representatives of these new " catholicizing " movements who have produced a complete translation of the Lambeth Report of 1930 with an introduction by Prof. Aalders on the character of the Anglican Church. I think it is the first instance of a complete translation of a Lambeth Report in a continental language. It has found very wide circulation in Holland. Never before the Anglican Church and its theology and liturgy have been so sympathetically studied by theologians and other members of the Dutch Church as at present, and I think it is time that attempts should be made to renew and tighten the ties which used to bind together the national churches of England and Holland in former days.

W. H. VAN DE POL.

THE ORTHODOX PRO-SYNOD

After negotiations lasting several years, the Œcumenical Patriarch had issued invitations to the various Orthodox churches

to assemble in a Pro-Synod, which was to meet on Mount Athos on the Orthodox feast of Pentecost in June of this year. At the very last moment the Pro-Synod was postponed owing, it was stated, to difficulties caused by the economic crisis.

No one, who is aware of the disastrous violence with which the general crisis has fallen on Near Eastern countries, will be inclined to discount this explanation. Greece is bankrupt. The foreign trade of Yugoslavia, both import and export, has fallen by more than 40% in two years. The Rumanian Government is barely able to find money to pay its own functionaries. Poverty and, much more, uncertainty have half-paralysed the general social life of these countries. It may well have seemed to the heads of the Orthodox churches as impracticable to hold a council now, as it was for the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon the ordinary decennial meeting of the Lambeth Conference in 1918.

There is, however, reason to suppose that there were contributory difficulties about the relation of the Russian Church to the Pro-Synod. The Œcumenical Patriarchate desired to invite representatives both of the Metropolitan Sergius and the so-called Synodal Church, in order that the Pro-Synod might reach a conclusion about their conflicting claims. The Serbs protested strongly that the Church of Sergius was alone entitled to be invited. The Synodal Church, they said, was openly uncanonical and irregular, a parody of Orthodoxy. In addition, no one was able to suggest a satisfactory method by which the Russian exiles could be properly represented.

The postponement of the Pro-Synod has prevented any further developments in Anglican and Orthodox relations. It is important that the question of Anglican Orders should be settled, not because of its intrinsic difficulties, but because the present uncertainty distracts attention from more important problems. So far all the ancient churches except Antioch, which for sufficiently intelligible reasons has not found it possible or expedient to come to a decision, have recognized the validity of Anglican ordinations. The new national churches of Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland have not yet spoken. There remains always the difficulty that the Russian Church is not free to act.

The latest theological statements have been of a favourable character. Professor Dyovouniotes declares that the Bull of Leo XIII was contrary to the received Roman Catholic

teaching about the Sacraments, and that there is nothing in Orthodox doctrine to prevent a recognition of Anglican Orders. Professor Arseniev states that the autocephalous churches may recognize them without further difficulty. Greater contact between the two Churches and more mutual knowledge are the pre-requisite of further advance. Ignorance and apathy are the chief obstacles, and both are exploited by hostile propaganda.

REVIEWS

Deuteronomy, The Framework of the Code. By Adam C. Welch, D.D. (Oxford University Press. 1932). 12*s.* 6*d.*

Those who were both provoked and stimulated by Prof Welch's earlier work on the *Code of Deuteronomy* will have been awaiting with some eagerness his treatment of the "framework" which surrounds it. Whether, indeed, this title is the best that can be invented for the opening and closing sections of the Book, is open to question. A "framework" necessarily implies the dependence of that which is built up and supported within it; and if one thing is certain about this most confused collection of historical and legislative matter, it is that the Code itself must have existed, more or less as it now stands, long before it was supplemented by an introduction and an epilogue. It would be more correct, perhaps, to call these the "frame" and the Code itself the "picture" which is set off by it, the relation of dependence being thus completely reversed. This is in fact Prof. Welch's own view, and his choice of title may be due to an unconscious confusion in terminology.

When was the Code first written down, by whom, and for whom? These are questions about which the author has already expressed his strong convictions, and he has seen no reason since to modify the conclusions of his former work. He has no doubt at all that the Deuteronomic Code was the law-book of northern Israel, that it came into separate existence on the division of the Kingdom, and that it was ranked ultimately by the side of the Priestly Code of Judah when the "remanent" Israelites of the northern tribes turned to Jerusalem as their rallying-point and religious centre after the fall of Samaria. That it was the Book of the Law found in the Temple by the High Priest, Hilkiah, and used by King Josiah as the basis for his great reformation, Prof. Welch refuses absolutely to allow; and there are undoubtedly grave arguments against this theory. The chief of these (which are dealt with fully in the introductory chapter of the present book) is, without doubt, the difficulty of understanding how the Law of Holiness, after being superseded (on this view) by the Deuteronomic Code, not only regained its place of honour but was used as the nucleus of the later Priestly Code.

Prof. Welch rightly stresses the extreme improbability of this inexplicable return to the more ancient Law-book, with its peculiar and utterly un-Deuteronomic outlook and phraseology. He urges that the post-exilic priesthood did not "go back" to the Law of Holiness, because they had never abandoned it. They simply accepted the Code of Deuteronomy as a friendly gesture to their brethren of northern Israel and incorporated it amongst their sacred books, with hardly any alteration, as a venerable but obsolete memorial of the nation's past.

To support this verdict, which as may be expected, is cogently argued by the author, the evidence of the "framework" is necessarily indispensable. These chapters of historical narrative and semi-historical exhortation must, on this theory, emanate also from northern Israel; and they must be examined, therefore, for proofs of their origin. The difficulty of this task will be familiar to all who have wrestled with this extraordinary tangle of alternating singular and plural address and constantly shifting change of subject; and it may be said at once that Prof. Welch has done much to clear up the confusion. His judgment, in brief (as against that of the "scissors and paste" school of criticism) is that large sections of this introductory and concluding matter are to be ascribed to single authors, writing for different purposes and at different epochs in the nation's history. Thus, Chapters 6 and 8, though themselves dissimilar in their point of view, both reflect a time when Israel was in the ascendant and needed to be reminded of its dependence upon God for its success, while Chapter 7, with its invective against alien marriages, implies that the nation was surrounded by heathen neighbours, of whom it stood in dread and through whom its faith was in danger of extinction. All three of these writers, on the other hand, are clearly distinguishable from the composer of the historical introduction (Chapters 1 to 3) by the fact that they are not concerned to give a connected narrative but simply select such incidents as are best fitted to enforce the lesson which they have at heart. This clue becomes of special significance when it is applied to Chapters 4 and 5; and the two sections which Prof. Welch devotes to their examination are perhaps the most notable in his book. To these, however, the reader must be referred, and it must suffice here to say that the conclusions reached by the author are themselves a guarantee of the soundness of his critical analysis.

Enough will now have been said to indicate Dr Welch's

treatment of his material, a treatment which is throughout both refreshingly clear-headed and richly suggestive. It remains to consider how far his conclusions may be held to reinforce his chief and central theme. It is, of course, common knowledge that the narrative-matter of *Deuteronomy* is closely related to the source E and not to the source J. Prof. Welch has, therefore, no very great opposition to combat when he contends that this connection is not merely partial but absolute. There can, in fact, be little doubt that the writers of the Book (apart from later Priestly redactors) derived their knowledge exclusively from this source. But to what conclusion does this lead us? To Prof. Welch it is naturally a strong corroboration of his North Israel theory; for is not E acknowledged to be of northern origin? It follows (of necessity) that both the Code and its "framework" are the work of northern Israelites, some writing before, and some after, the fall of Samaria. The rise of this great spiritual "movement" can then be traced clearly to the influence of the northern prophets as far at least as from Elijah to Hosea. How much further than this we may go is less certain. Amos undoubtedly may be counted to the north, Judean as he was; but it is a little astonishing to find Jeremiah included in the list without comment (p. 199). We are not sure, too, that the author is making sufficient allowance for the spread of the teaching of men like Elijah and Hosea beyond the borders of the kingdom of Israel. Surely it is at least possible that their influence could have fired the prophetic schools of Judah? Be that as it may, Dr Welch appears to have made out an excellent case for his theory in that his conclusions follow almost inevitably from his premisses. Indeed, if these are unassailable, the voice of criticism is silenced.

And yet there still lingers something more than an uneasy suspicion that all is not well. If the Deuteronomic school of style and thought was so exclusively native to northern Israel while the kingdom of Judah possessed its own peculiar outlook and phraseology, it becomes very difficult to understand how, why, or when the combined history of both kingdoms was edited throughout from a distinctively Deuteronomic standpoint. Are we to believe that this was the work of northern historians writing after the destruction of their own monarchy and even after the fall of the sister kingdom? Such a conclusion would seem inevitable on Prof. Welch's view, but it opens up a number of serious difficulties. Why, for example, was this history adopted

without radical alteration by the historians of Jerusalem, and why had these no history of their own? Why, again, is so much space given to Solomon and his Temple? What interest had a northern Israelite in these things? If, on the other hand, we adopt the more natural explanation, that the Books of *Kings* were composed by writers of the southern Kingdom out of materials collected from both north and south, it follows that the Deuteronomic School was one of the most powerful influences in pre-exilic Judah. We are, in fact, back where we started, and there is no *a priori* reason why the old Josianic theory should not be right after all! How then are we to account for Deuteronomy's exclusive use of E? That question certainly remains to be answered, but it can only be answered satisfactorily when we have accounted for the use of E in the narrative of I Kings, 8, 9. Here, in the very heart of the kingdom of Judah, we find the Ark and the Tables of Stone, so much emphasized in *Deuteronomy*; and these are described as having originated not at Sinai (J) but at Horeb (E)! It is, perhaps, significant that when Prof. Welch comes to deal with the Ark, his treatment exhibits a certain weakness and hesitation. He thinks that the writer of Chapter 10, 1 f. intended to minimize the significance of this ancient Palladium by making it merely the receptacle in which the Tables were contained, and he infers, somewhat strangely, that this attitude must be traced to the Jerusalem priesthood (pp. 64-67). But this is directly contrary to the known facts. So far from desiring to supersede the Ark, the Jerusalem priesthood sought rather to free it from all connection with the Tables of Stone and to exalt it to a special eminence as the Throne Seat of the Divine Presence. What Prof. Welch's argument really demands is that the slighting of the Ark should proceed from *northern* Israel. That he does not at once accept a conclusion so favourable to his own views would seem to suggest a doubt as to its probability. It is, in fact, by no means obvious why a northern Israelite should concern himself with a matter which was of so little interest outside the immediate sphere of the Temple's influence.

There is a real problem here which we do not think has been sufficiently weighed by Dr Welch, and until it is solved the essential mystery of *Deuteronomy* must remain as profound as ever. It may, indeed, be not too daring to predict that he will find it impenetrable, unless he is prepared to admit the existence of a school of thought in the southern Kingdom which inherited

and used exclusively the Horeb tradition of E. Meanwhile he has earned the gratitude of all students of the Old Testament by providing them with fresh food for thought and ample material for discussion and meditation. If he has not shaken our adhesion to the prevalent theory, he has done much to illuminate the obscurities of the problem and we shall look forward with interest to his further researches in this field.

W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS.

Die Theologie Gersons. By WALTER DRESS. 7 *marks.*
Die Menschheitsbedeutung Jesu bei Martin Kähler. By HEINRICH PETEAN. 6 *marks* 50. (Both published by Herr Bertelsmann, Gutersloh).

THESE are two able pamphlets which we can fitly join together because both have something to say on the problems of the approach to history. Herr Petean is absolutely convinced of the fundamental importance of the theology of Herr Kähler. We, for our part, are far more convinced of his attitude to history. In history we may see with Ranke " was eigentlich gewesen ist," or, if we take out day, with Lamprecht " was eigentlich geworden ist," or with C. F. Lehmann Haupt " das Gewordenes als Werdenes verstehen." With Herr Petean we envisage facts as a process. It grades with the Crocean doctrine of the reality of history as the reality of mind acting and always active.

Professor Dress approaches the question of the theology of Gerson in the earnest attempt to reconstruct the past. That there were reformers before the Reformation we have long known. Do not Ullmann's two volumes stand upon our shelves ? The curious point in the book before is that though its author lays all the stress at his command—and it is considerable—on the spiritual longings of the Middle Ages, he passes by the authorship of *The Imitation of Christ* of which Gerson has long been suspected as the actual author. At the same time Professor Dress examines with acuteness the significance of Gerson, and he has of course no difficulty in showing the mystical desires that lay at the back of his theology. It was a task worth doing, though we confess that we might have been spared the very complete account of Nominalism, even though it left its mark upon Gerson. Yet perhaps, after all, the author is right, for the Nominalism of the mystic accounted in no little degree for the aridness and formality that characterized his mysticism.

There is a clear survey of the influence of John Gerson upon Martin Luther, and it is more than possible that the conceptions of the mystic of the nature of the Church and its authority permeated the mind of the reformer. Luther not only knew his Gerson, but he also knew his Bernard of Clairvaux and Bonaventure, Tauler and the *Theologica Germanica*. We cannot afford to overlook the attitude of Gerson to the Bible. To him it

> " is a Rule of Faith, which it is only necessary to understand aright ; against it there is no appeal to authority or to the decisions of human reason ; nor can custom, law, or practice have any weight if proved to be contrary to Holy Scripture."

Lying behind the mystical writings which Gerson wrote and Luther perused, there is the power of Dionysius and the pseudo-Dionysius. We wish we could induce such a learned man as Professor Dress to write a monograph on Dionysius and the pseudo-Dionysius, for there is no work on medieval scholarship more urgently required excepting perhaps a history of the law of nature.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft. Zweite Auflage. Herausgegeben von HERMANN GUNKEL und LEOPOLD ZSCHARNACK. (J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], Tübingen. 1927-1931. Bound, 280 *marks ;* unbound, 240 *marks* former recommended).

IT will be remembered that Mr Aldous Huxley asserts, in one of his essays, that he finds the small hand edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* an ideal form of literature for reading when travelling. There are, in fact, few more diverting ways of passing a leisure hour than by looking through the pages of an encyclopædia. *Oxford Magazine*, Oxford Manner, Oxford Marmalade, Oxford Martyrs, Oxford Movement—what a series of subjects for meditation can be found in successive headings ! But, however welcome an encyclopædia may be as a means of distraction, entertainment is not its primary purpose. Its main function is to be a tool which the scholar will find useful when engaged in his studies. Pre-eminently, it must be a work of reference, like Crockford or Bradshaw. And accordingly the criterion of the value of an encyclopædia is to be found not, for example, in the excellence of its illustrations, but in the extent

to which it satisfies the student's demand for definite, concrete, information. That is, it must be accurate, concise, well-arranged, well-referenced, and free from misprints.

The recently completed German theological encyclopædia which we have before us will, we believe, admirably come up to most of these demands. It is, in fact, a work which is badly needed by many an English theological library. For it happens to contain just the information which is missing in the ordinary English encyclopædias. In particular, it is very full in matters of biography. Column after column is made up of the biographies of past and present theologians and others eminent in the world of religion (especially of Continental Protestantism). And it is just this information which, as every student knows, it is often difficult to lay hands on. If only the *Dictionary of National Biography* could be extended to a *Dictionary of World Biography*, what an intellectual "labour-saving-device" would result! In the *R.G.G.*[2] (for so the new work is to be quoted), we have noticed that the following names[1] among recent and contemporary British theologians have been deemed worthy of articles: F. E. Brightman, F. C. Burkitt, Randall T. Davidson, W. E. Gladstone, C. Gore, J. Rendel Harris, J. E. Harrison, A. C. Headlam, W. R. Inge, J. Mackinnon, H. R. Mackintosh, W. Sanday, B. H. Streeter, W. Temple, F. R. Tennant, C. C. J. Webb.

It is natural to compare such a work as this with Hasting's *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. To begin with, it is much shorter. As against the 13 volumes of Hasting's, *R.G.G.*[2] has only 5 (albeit, fatter volumes). In the German work, the articles are more compressed; there are very rarely quotations in it; and (as is usual in German encyclopædias) there is an elaborate system of cross referencing. Moreover the space given to Philosophy and Comparative Religion is relatively very much less than in *H.E.R.E.*, "Aristotle" receiving barely a column. There are, however, a few valuable articles in this field. "Plato" receives five columns from the competent pen of Dr Constantin Ritter; Professor Linke has written an excellent article on *Phänomenologie;* and there is also a good article on *Neukantianismus*.

Among the contributors of other articles are such outstanding names as the following: Bertholet ("Heilige Schriften"); Brilioth ("Newman," "Pusey"); Bultmann ("Paulus"); Dibelius ("Hermas"); Eissfeldt ("Feste und Ferien in Israel,"

[1] We make no attempt here at a complete list

" Religions-geschichtliche Schule "); Hempel (" Samaria "); Sippell (" Quäker "); Tillich (" Philosophie "); Titius (" Sittlichkeit "); Windisch (" Glaube im N.T."); Wobbermin (" Schleiermacher "); Wünsch (" Religiös-Sozialistische Bewegung ").

Two suggestions for the next edition: that the initials of the contributors be systematically given (this would be of great assistance for purposes of identification); and that the list of abbreviations of literature be printed at the beginning of each volume.

F. L. Cross.

The Elements of the Spiritual Life; A Study in Ascetical Theology. By F. P. Harton, Warden of the Sisters of Charity, Knowle, Bristol. With an Introduction by the Rt. Rev. Mark Carpenter-Garnier, D.D., Lord Bishop of Colombo. (S.P.C.K., 1932). 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

> " Il est vrai que mes travaux absorbent toute ma vie . . . j'ai cru trop aisément qu'on se peut dispenser de cette surveillance de l'âme . . . que nos vieux maîtres appellent du beau nom de l'oraison. La critique n'y supplée point. La familiarité pour ainsi dire professionnelle dans laquelle je vis depuis longtemps auprès de ces hommes d'une spiritualité si haute et si parfaite, m'a fait illusion."

Readers of M. Georges Bernanos' tragic study of a sceptic priest—*L'Imposture*—will remember the setting of these words, wrung in a night of self-revealing agony from the learned writer on the *Mystiques florentins*, M. le Chanoine Cénabre; wrenched from him by a simple Saint, whose unworldliness had brought him to *un modeste emploi à Notre Dame des Victoires* to be *le confesseur des bonnes*, the abbé Chevance, desperately summoned at midnight by the sceptical scholar. It is a startling picture of a condition not uncommon since " Mysticism " has been popularized with more zeal than discrimination, the condition of those among us, who possibly unwittingly, mistake intellectual interest for experience, and give to the emotions and intellect what properly belongs to the mind—in that sense to which Fr. Harton recalls us:

> " In the traditional theology, ' mind ' means not the intellectual faculties, as in the modern use of the term, but the essence or highest part of the spirit, which is made in the image of God."

In England, some twenty-three years ago, Baron von Hügel's *The Mystical Element of Religion*, besides fulfilling his intention, unfortunately seemed to create a fashion of writing and talking about what was supposed to be Mysticism. Clothed in pseudo-psychological jargon, it attracted a crowd, unequipped by knowledge or training to appraise it. Hence arose a fear among responsible theologians as to its spiritual results. It is not surprising that the S.P.C.K., in conjunction with the English Church Union, should have aided the author to produce this book; sound, almost incredibly comprehensive, precisely apt too to an urgent need, as the second of the special Centenary Publications. Fr. Harton directs it to the Anglican Communion, to clergy and also to laity, according to their several responsibilities and wants, with the hope that it may be "of real use . . . and not without interest." Many hopes fail to fructify; this one can hardly fall sterile to the ground.

According to their differentiated measures and circumstances, clergy, theological, and also lay, students, not least those isolated people who must depend largely on books, and perhaps even some half-in-earnest dabblers, will find what they cannot, in a single volume at any rate, find elsewhere, so clearly said, so accurate in expression, within the limits of the possible, so easy to grasp. Lucid exposition, brevity, insight, point, are among Fr. Harton's notable and ever-present gifts. It is not a book to borrow, for it will not yield itself up to a single reading; it cannot be really used within any period proper to loan methods.

There is no strained brilliance, no striving after unexpectedness; there are no epigrams for their own sake, and only two stock words from current jargon, urge, and *attrait*. The book's distinction is to achieve profound significance in plain, essential, precise exposition; *e.g.*, on p. 34: "*Credo in Deum* is the language of the Creed, not *credo de Deo*." Every instructed Christian knows this fact; but the turn of the phrase may possibly lead some where they had not been before. Again, on p. 285, we read what, certainly in a fashion, we knew already:

> "the crucifixion was the central not the final act. The purpose of sacrifice was not the offering of a death but of a life";

yet, reading that, some of us see something we had hitherto missed. Another instance of this inescapable lucidity—in that crucial place of the spiritual life, self-examination—occurs in the chapter on "Temptation":

> " that misleading term ' besetting sin.' . . . Now sin is an act of will, . . . we either sin or we do not—there is no ' besetting ' about it ; what can and does ' beset ' the soul is temptation."

Once more, which of us wholly undeserves the sharp reminder on p. 137 ? Many people who have, as they say, " never done anybody any harm " are even less responsible for " doing anybody any good." Lastly, in a far profounder context,

> " The sight of God comes first, then the sight of self, and all holiness springs from these two sights." (p. 226).

His quiet sentences, so pregnant and incisive, satisfy the intellect, rivet attention, turn a relentless, constant searchlight on to the soul's shifts and secrets, convict the conscience, steady the errant will. In the recent flood of unnecessary or half-needed spiritual books, this is one of the singular achievements. It is no small advantage that Fr. Harton is acquainted with the new psychology as with the old, and so gives both their due.

It may be useful, in the interests of the next edition to point out that on p. 130, " parlied " appears for parleyed.

Generally and rightly, accurate teachers sharply distinguish between ascetical and mystical theology. Since Fr. Harton treats of the *Elements of Spiritual Life*, both must have their place in his book. Parts I and II handle, as ascetical theology must, conduct and practice, together with the aims and means subservient and contributory to these. Part III, " The Sacraments," expounds the reality and meaning of these God-given aids in the Christian perpetual warfare, supporting " the activity of a soul which is interiorly renouncing the enemy." Not until Parts IV and V does he dwell directly on that side of spiritual life where mystical experience more or less directly enters, and, with the few " proficient," finally dominates the hidden, inner life. If some readers find Parts I to III (the ascetical section), more instructive than Parts IV and V, on " Prayer and the Mystical Ways," that may partly arise from the rather curious fact, since disciplining daily life should be the business of us all, whereas even a small measure of mystical experience is only given to some, and a great measure to very, very few—that many less treatises on ascetical theology appear than on mystical. If any writers have over sharply separated them, in this valuable book they are set side by side, are even to some extent synthesized. Readers who perhaps fancy that they " know all about " Parts

IV and V, may even there discover what they suppose is familiar presented afresh and suggestively, not without a little correction of errors, and some readjustments of views which have been considered "judgments." Different parts of the book will help different people. Possibly the chapter, in Part II, on "The Enemies of the Soul," the timely teaching in chapter XXI, "Liturgical Prayer," and that on "Perfection," in Part V may very specially and practically help not a few.

In his Introduction, the Bishop of Colombo has characteristically seized the book's core:

> "The lesson of this book is a lesson of hope. . . . The two points I wish to stress concern the teaching Fr. Harton gives on mortification and prayer. I am very grateful to him for his chapter on mortification. It strikes me that his teaching on this subject is most opportune. Many of us are being attracted now to the idea of spiritual advance and growth in prayer, and nothing would please us more than to fly lightly to the heights with the minimum of strain and effort. Moreover, for many people there is the temptation to imagine already they can recognize in their own souls the signs of advanced mystical experience, of which they read in the Lives of the Saints, or possibly in books which describe not too wisely the mystical life. The fact is we have to learn that the only way forward is the way of the Cross . . . we must learn to entrust ourselves to mortification as to a dear friend of our soul."

The present age, perhaps more than most, is apt to kick against that secular puzzle, the purpose of pain is life. Its intricacies are not to be solved in a sentence; yet the suggestion (p. 170)

> "God tests the soul daily by pain, not in order that he may hurt it . . . but that he may purify it and give it somewhat to offer him,"—*Somewhat to offer*—surely uses our inevitable sacrificial penury as a beginning of understanding?

GERALDINE HODGSON.

Peter Abailard. By J. G. SIKES. (Cambridge University Press). 12*s.* 6*d.*

MR SIKES'S *Peter Abailard* is a welcome addition to the literature of its subject. It is well-informed and scholarly, and the only English book known to me which is devoted to the great twelfth century teacher is neither the one nor the other; so that one is

not surprised to find it unnoticed in Mr Sikes's bibliography. Moreover, since any considerable study of Abelard (this form of the name, if less correct, seems to me the most natural one to use in English) has appeared in our language (for the second edition of Mr Poole's *Illustrations* contained no additions to the original text) our knowledge of his writings has been increased owing to the publication by German scholars of several logical treatises previously unknown, and of a newly discovered fragment of an *Apologia* for his theological views in reply to the strictures of St. Bernard.

Mr Sikes has given us a clear and careful account of his hero's life; chapters on his teaching respecting faith and reason (this is one of the best parts of the book, though Mr Sikes—who does not seem to have used the important work of M. Gilson—identifies far too closely the positions of St. Anselm and St. Thomas in regard to the relations of the two), on the *Sic et Non*, on the logical treatises (here utilizing the new material above mentioned), on his doctrines of God and creation, the Trinity and the person of Christ, on his critical theories and on his doctrine of the Atonement: a "conclusion" which is excellent in its general judgment of Abelard's character and influence (though I venture to think that the personality of the man stands out more clearly in our sources than Mr Sikes seems quite willing to allow); and, finally, two useful appendices, one on the chronology of Abelard's writings and one on the translations of Aristotle which were known to him.

Dr Nairne, in his preface, expresses the wish that Mr Sikes had added a chapter on Abelard and mediaeval Latin verse; and there are omissions in respect of topics that did not, like this, lie outside of the scope of his plan, which make it impossible to regard his book as an adequate monograph on the life and thought of the "Peripatetic of Pallet." But Mr Sikes is, Dr Nairne tells us, a young scholar and perhaps he may some day incorporate this capital study in a larger work upon its subject; in view of which possibility it may be useful to add a few notes of points which occurred to me in reading it as requiring correction.

The most important of these concern the classical background of Abelard's logic; Mr Sikes strikes one as moving not very familiarly in this region. He twice speaks of Porphyry's *Isagoge* or *Introduction* in the plural (pp. xiii, 88); he gives "cat" and "dog" as examples of *singular* names (p. 103); and renders *primus* "chief" instead of "first" in translating (p. 116) from

Abelard the traditional statement about Anaxagoras which, as he rightly states, Abelard probably derived from Augustine. On p. 151, misled, I think, by the erroneous punctuation of Cousin's edition (in a passage where, moreover, his text certainly stands in need of emendation), Mr Sikes attributes to Abelard the surprising statement that *ensis* and *mucro*, "animal" and "man" are two parallel pairs of words, the members of each pair being identical with each other in the same sense. But Abelard's words (and he is careful in his use of conjunctions) are *ensis et mucro, vel substantia et corpus sive animal sive homo sive etiam Socrates*. An *ensis* is numerically the same with a *mucro;* the same thing may be called by either name. Again, a substance may be numerically identical with a body, an animal, a man, and in fine Socrates; here, after four terms of decreasing generality, one comes to the singular term which denotes the individual to whom the other more general terms may all of them be applied. Compare a sentence with the like meaning which Mr Sikes cites in a note on the following page: *sicut eadem est substantia ensis et gladii, vel hujus hominis et hujus animalis* (*hic homo, hoc animal* are of course singular terms).

Perhaps I may be allowed, as Mr Sikes refers to a remark of mine on the history of the word *theologia*, to add that he goes beyond what I intended to say in stating that *theologia* had before Abelard's time meant Christology only. I said that in eastern Christendom it had been commonly used for the doctrine of Christ's divinity; and I mentioned also the more general sense borne by the word in 'Dionysius the Areopagite,' which probably suggested to Abelard his own use of it. But my account of the matter was I fear, very far from complete.

There is a misprint of "produced" for "predicated" on p. 95; and in the second paragraph on p. 213 the words "of the old law" have been apparently dropped out between "Sacraments" and "were merely figures of a subsequent truth." In the reference to de Ghellinck, p. 27 n., the page should be given as 66, not 64. On p. 56 "Wibert" is a slip for "Wibald."

C. C. J. Webb.

The Ecclesiastical History of Essex under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth. By Harold Smith, D.D. (Benham & Co., Colchester). 15*s*.

All of us who care for the seventeenth century are familiar with

Dr Shaw's *History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth.* What Dr Shaw has accomplished for the whole of England, Dr Smith has accomplished for the county of Essex. The reward of the publication of such a book must inevitably be the addition to knowledge that the author has contributed, and of the worth of this addition we entertain no manner of doubt. The period covered is from the opening of the Long Parliament until the settlement effected by the Act of Uniformity, and the author contrives to introduce enough of general history to make his particular narrative attractive even to the average reader of ecclesiastical history. At the same time it is obvious that he must refer to the events of the reign of Charles I, and indeed of this reign we have a reasonably complete account. This is manifestly the right course to pursue, and we think that Dr Harold Smith is correct in holding that Essex is a county of considerable size, allowing him a field extensive enough upon which to establish conclusions. Of the general value of this volume we are certain, and we are no less certain of the particular value. For instance, there is much from the autobiographies of Richard Drake, the editor of Bishop Andrewes's *Devotions*, and of Ralph Josselin. The cult of the unpublished is one which its worshippers are apt to conduct to too great lengths, but the author possesses enough knowledge to see when he has come to the place marked Stop. He is quite right in maintaining that the autobiography of Drake enables us to grasp the position of a young Laudian, and this in itself almost justifies the existence of this book. We are also glad to read the account given by Dr Anthony Walker of the origin of the *Eikon Basilike* and the adventures of its manuscripts. There is a most useful map and good illustrations, and an wholly admirable index. We miss, however, a table of contents. Of the map and the index we cannot speak in sufficiently high terms.

The answers of Richard Drake to the charges preferred against him occupy no less than twelve pages, and they are most helpful in seeing the ecclesiastical position of men like-minded with him. The High Churchman of to-day will find that his pedigree at least stretches back to Richard Drake and we read the questions put to him and his admirable answers with the keenest attention. On the *Eikon Basilike* we read much that is attractive. This additional evidence leaves little doubt in our mind that John Gauden is its actual author.

Of the general questions raised in this book we think that

Dr Harold Smith does not differ from the answers propounded by Dr Shaw. There is just one point we should like to present. The Prayer Book could not be used under the Puritan régime. But to the vicars in the habit of holding daily services, did this present a serious obstacle ? Surely, it was easy for them nominally to close their Prayer Books, and yet from memory to employ the services so familiar to them. This of course we cannot prove, but of its substantial truth we entertain but little doubt.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

Supernatural Religion in its Relation to Democracy. By S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Master of the Temple, etc. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, Ltd. 1932). 15*s*.

THE Master of the Temple has produced a sincere and thoughtful survey of the prospects of Supernatural Religion in the modern conditions of life and thought to which he gives the comprehensive name of " Democracy." The modern world, as he points out, tends to seek satisfaction in a new gospel called " Humanism," based on a belief in the inherent goodness of man-kind and its power to relate itself successfully with the universe without any " given " knowledge or aid from a transcendent source. Mr Carpenter's book is

> " an essay in the direction of that comprehensiveness which I believe to be implied in the Christian religion "—

the comprehensiveness which recognizes the real truth underlying this faith in " democracy," while it holds fast also to the transcendental belief, thus co-ordinating grace with moral endeavour, revealed with natural theology, institutional with philosophical religion. Needless to say, this is an " essay " (in the first sense of that word) which has been obligatory on all thoughtful Christians of recent times, especially on those who have had the responsibility of expounding the Bible and the Creed to the modern man, and such will have formulated more or less vaguely at " the back of their minds " most of what the author has here successfully put together : but they will be none the less grateful to him for an exposition of the theme based on wide reading and set forth with much eloquence and plentiful illustration. If it is necessary sometimes to point out marks of haste in the composition, and to demur to occasional lapses into the rhetorical, these are only minor defects in a sound piece of

work, which it is hoped may reach a wider public than that which ordinarily reads theological books.

The scheme of the book is this. Having in a previous work approached the subject from the point of view of the need of modern democracy for a revelation, the author now begins "from the other end," asking, first, if there *is* still a Supernatural Christianity in the field and if the world is actually feeling after it, and then proceeding to examine its "record," *i.e.*, the part played in the world hitherto by the historical Jesus in his Church. Afterwards he expounds in detail the contents of Supernatural Christianity in relation to Creation, Revelation (through Christ), and Grace, showing in each department how it can be interpreted to harmonize with the truth underlying the faith of Humanism. Lastly he speculates as to "the Future of Organized Religion" and the prospects of the coming of that synthesis in which the Righteousness that "has looked down from heaven" will be seen to meet the aspiring Truth that "shall flourish out of the earth." Two longer quotations may be given to illustrate the general drift of the exposition and to indicate both the school of theology on which the author founds his hope of the reconciliation, and also the kind of human material which he means by the term "democracy":—

> (pp. 181 f.). "Belief in divine immanence enlarges the notion of Creation. It is that part of the Christian belief about God which leads up to the Logos-theology, the particular doctrine of the divine Logos through whom all things are created, who in the fullness of time effects a creaturely entrance into the world which he has made. . . . But its chief interest and value in connexion with the particular argument of this book is that it prepares the way for the doctrine of the spiritual return of Christ at Pentecost, and his immanent presence in the Church. In this way it meets and touches the approach of believers in democracy, because it asserts what they assert—that the truth which is in men is of a higher quality than the truth which is in things, and further that, if there could be added together the truth that is in all men, there would be a larger thing than the best individual or the best class can produce in isolation or sole power. It differs only from the faith of non-Christian democrats in that it assigns a specific name to the truth which it follows, and that the addition sum, while it must certainly be worked out in the exercise-books of human experience, is believed to

have been actually worked out by God already. This . . . makes all the difference between the crusade of faith and the opportunism of sheer experiment. Immanence is only part of the full Christian teaching. Those who say 'God is in everything,' unless they add, 'which he has made,' unless, in fact, they *begin* by saying, 'God creates,' will soon be in danger of supposing that the Creation completely represents and expresses God. . . . They would take any and every form of self-expression, and would call it God. For Immanence alone is Pantheism. And Pantheism, applied to the world of politics and human action, is unidealistic democracy."

(pp. 317 ff., as to the prospects of ultimate acceptance for Christianity).

"It would be a sin against the spirit of humility, and doubtless also against the spirit of truth, to assume that 'the elect' are precisely those who practise 'organized religion.' It would be an even graver sin for a Christian, however great his Church-reforming zeal, to assert the opposite of this—that all, or even nearly all, 'the elect' are 'without,' and that all, or even nearly all, who are 'within,' are illegitimate usurpers, or, still more, that 'within' and 'without' are meaningless expressions. We shall perhaps be on the right lines if we remember that the 'outsider' of whom Jesus said, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel,' was one of whom the 'religious' people reported that 'he is worthy, for he loveth our nation, and hath built us a synagogue . . .' Who can say? A Christian democrat, looking at the world, will not hastily pronounce that any casual or temporary expression of the *vox populi* is, without more ado, the *vox Dei*. But he will believe that, as mankind is surveyed over a large area and a long period of time, the kind of thing that decent, ordinary people are found to be feeling and thinking and doing is something which God put into them and means to be there. If that be so, it has the capacity to respond to Christ. . . ." But "That which is now revealed in Christ is a real thing . . . it would be fatal to enlist all comers, and at the same time to re-assure them by explaining that it means nothing."

In such a wide survey as this, which includes rapid summaries of the Gospel story and Church History as well as an interpretation of Christian theology proper, we must expect to find individual

points of view difficult to accept, even though with the main attitude we may be in hearty agreement. The treatment of the New Testament, chiefly, betrays signs of haste, amounting sometimes, we think, to positive error. The printer (or typist ?) should not have been allowed to get away with such annoying blunders as " For all live *under* Him " in a quotation from the Gospels (p. 105), to which we must add *abullition* (twice), *decendum* for *dicendum* in the Latin quotation from Horace (p. 119), and " guilt-edged securities " (p. 93). [Mr Carpenter is so fond of word-play that for a moment one suspected a " mot " lurking in this last mis-spelling !]. But it is a more serious thing than careless proof-reading when we find I Pet., ii, 24, twice quoted as " He bare in his body the sins *of the whole world*," with an argument built on this interpolation (pp. 247, 249). And there are several hasty interpretations and generalizations about the New Testament which Mr Carpenter might re-consider for a second edition of his book (*e.g.*, the contrast between the " children " and the " dogs " in our Lord's words to the Syro-Phœnician being regarded as an ethical rebuke, p. 99 ; or the alleged absence from St. Paul's writings of the great prophetical dictum " I will have mercy and not sacrifice," p. 257 n., against which see Rom. xi, 30-31, xv, 9). Where only a rapid " impression " is possible of the ministry of Christ, an author is bound to give his own impression as effectively as he can, and no doubt Mr Carpenter is, in the main, right about the two strands he finds in the story—the " bearing about of the Presence of God " on the one hand, and on the other the extension of " the franchise of his regard to every human being," together with the desire " that man should be free "—free even to exclude himself, if so he wills (pp. 89 ff.). All this is admirable. But Mr Carpenter is not quite exempt from the tendency of what we might call the " super-superhuman " interpretation of the Gospel story, in reaction from the old rationalizing school, to be carried away by its own fancies of what the Messiahship of Jesus implied, and, as has been wittily said by a contemporary teacher, to be " more apocalyptic than the apocalypses."

The case in point here is the treatment of our Lord's Temptation ; and as this is so fundamental a section of the Gospel tradition, more likely, it may be, than any other to have received its form directly from our Lord himself, I hope it will not be thought hypercritical to complain that a book, which aims at commending the " supernatural " aspect of Jesus of Nazareth

to modern thought, should give a prominence to wonder-working in the supposed endowments of the Messiah or resources at the command of Jesus, which is not borne out either by the Temptation narrative or by the subsequent history. Two guiding lines are set for us for interpreting that mysterious disclosure—first and foremost the meaning of the three quotations from Deuteronomy with which the three temptations are rebutted—and then (though only in a secondary degree, because here the import is less certain) the wording and imagery in each case in which Satan's suggestions are clothed. Mr Carpenter's description (pp. 87 ff.) does not attempt to apply the former test, nor indeed does it take much account of the latter. He begins by assuming that it is on the "possession by our Lord of unusual powers that the meaning . . . must depend"—an assumption only to be justified, and that for only two of the temptations, by supposing that the title "Son of God" necessarily implied to Jewish ears the possession of such inherent powers. This we do not know. Indeed the corollary to the title suggested by the tempter in the two cases is not so much the possession and exercise of unusual powers by the "Son," as the will of God to maintain and protect the "Son" in all circumstances. Frankly, all that is said here about

> "a refusal to arrogate to himself, by means that are not generally available, a magic comfort that his brothers could not have,"

or the temptation

> "to overawe defenceless imaginations and to compel an inferior faith by the calculated pressure of a staged 'miraculous' arrival"

—still more the attempt to confirm these interpretations by a statement that

> "not once nor twice in the rough gospel story, nor in the wilderness only, did he reject the possibility of being the Aladdin-Christ, with the wonderful lamp that would supply all needs, or of being the *Deus ex machina*, who would impress all beholders . . ."

—belongs to the realm of rhetorical fancy, and certainly goes far "beyond the things that are written." This is the more regrettable because, if we are willing to restrict ourselves to the approved meaning of the Deuteronomic texts, we can, if not completely explain the Temptation-narrative, at least find in these citations three well-marked tendencies in the contemporary life of the nation, from which our Lord did in fact stand aside;

viz., the sceptical worldliness of the Jerusalem priesthood who had discarded any hope in the solemn promises of God—the self-satisfied legalism which thought it had done enough and put the "onus" on God to fulfil his side of the bargain ("tempting God")—and the very real temptation (to which the fringes of Judaism were actually succumbing) to compromise with Paganism in the hope of winning a supreme position in the world. To show that Jesus of Nazareth at starting his ministry had this grasp of the historical situation which confronted his nation might have served the purpose of the argument better than to speculate about unique magical powers which he might have exercised but did not.

While indicating, we hope not unfairly, a certain weakness in the book arising from the indulgence of a picturesque imagination, something may be said about the style. The Master of the Temple has many good and effective phrases. The parable of the lever in explaining the Divine and human sides of the Atonement (p. 242) could not be bettered :—

> "Man cannot save man. 'For it cost more to redeem their souls, so that he must let that alone for ever.' Goodwill, charity, education are not enough. They diagnose, they penetrate, they illuminate, they strengthen, but they cannot re-create. The lever that will redeem the world is only to be moved by one who has a *locus standi* that is independent of the world, and at the same time has a purchase for his effort on the soil of the world itself."

There are many similar illustrations of the argument eloquently put, and the style for the most part is forceful and dignified. But there is also some word-playing in the manner of Mr G. K. Chesterton, such as "love" being the perfect tense of "live" (a very dubious etymology !) (p. 220), and the jingle about what "it is easy to describe as 'stuffy'" doctrines and views being such "stuff" as saints are made of (p. 314). Some people like this manner ; many more, I should think, dislike it, especially in a theological essay. There is one juggle with words, however, on p. 228, which is so grotesque as to be, in connexion with the subject of the Cross, distressing.

It is pleasant to be able to turn from some necessary criticisms to cordial appreciation of the many valuable things in this book. Mr Carpenter acutely draws attention to two meanings of historical "rationalization" as applied to Christian history (p. 121)—

> " It may mean simply tracing the course of events in such a way that they are seen to have connexions, and to have followed an orderly development. Or it may mean an attempt to eliminate any supposed operation of the hand of God."

By using the truly scientific way of approaching the history of the Christian church—the way that includes religious appreciation—we can see that, amid much that seems disappointing to the modern democratic enthusiast, the essential ideal has wonderfully persisted. Interesting sidelights are given in the course of Mr Carpenter's historical resumé—*e.g.*, on the equalitarian spirit of the Laudian infliction of Church discipline ; and on the fostering of the democratic spirit and public responsibility among the workers by the class meetings of Methodism (p. 152). The author is of opinion that Christianity has achieved a real and striking transformation of political and social ideals in England during the last hundred years.

> " ' Manchester ' has been dethroned, and Bethlehem has begun to take its place, but Bethlehem is not mentioned."

The last sentence touches the real crux of the perplexity which besets this subject. When we have satisfied ourselves that supernatural Christianity, both in its ' record ' and in its contents, can justify itself to modern democratic criticism, how shall we establish that it still has in its traditional methods (sacraments, etc.) something to contribute which is " generally necessary " for the world's good, when the world seems in a sense to have already " helped itself " to the Christian treasures ? Mr Carpenter indicates a way of looking at this problem which appears particularly helpful, and which shall be our final quotation from his interesting book :—

> " The effect of Christ's advent on the world was immediate and universal. Since then humanity has nowhere been the same as it was before. It has been renewed, and lifted to a higher level. . . . But the effect has not everywhere been perceived. Pentecost has still to be used. Accordingly the resulting situation is the one with which psycho-analysts are familiar. An available or anyhow existing reserve is being unused, or incompletely used. . . . Christ, once given to the world, is stored in the world's life, not among the recognized, continuous motives, but for the most part only at the subconscious level. It does not seem altogether untrue to say that the Church is in this matter the conscious level of the

whole mind of humanity, and the 'world' is the sub-conscious. . . ." But "Christ does not live only in the sub-consciousness of humanity or in the consciousness of Christians, but he has his own transcendent existence in the eternal world" (pp. 273, 274).

STEPHEN LIBERTY.

The Life of George Eliot. By EMILIE and GEORGES ROMIEU. (Jonathan Cape). 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

WHEN Mr Cross published his *Life and Letters of George Eliot* in 1885 there was universal disappointment. He had clipped all the letters, and glided over those parts of the life that were most dramatic and of enthralling interest. He had decided in his own mind how much he would tell the general public, and for the next forty-five years kept every door that might lead to further information locked and guarded. His reserve was unfortunate though understandable. His portrait of George Eliot scarcely lives, and his three volumes were, as Edmond Scherer wrote at the time, the materials for a book rather than that book itself.

Mr Cross died a few years ago, and already three or four *Lives* of George Eliot have appeared. Since Lytton Strachey set a new mode of writing imaginative, spicy, not to say, malicious biographies, a host has rushed in to follow suit. Fortunately Strachey did not touch George Eliot, and the imaginative life of so complex a character has been undertaken by Emilie and Georges Romieu, who follow the lead of the brilliant Maurois, a man as piquant as Strachey, and without the malice.

Since the publication of *Adam Bede* in 1858, when it was hailed by Alexandre Dumas as the greatest novel of the age, George Eliot has had a long line of enthusiastic French admirers. Emile Montégut, Edmond Scherer, Abbé Brémond, Count de Vogüe, Proust, have accorded her a supreme place among novelists. And here are the joint authors of the new Life declaring that the novels are among the finest products of the human spirit. They are irresistibly attracted by the wit, humour, pathos and irony that abound in the earlier books, no less than by the tender ravishing tones whenever the author introduces little children, and the poor of the earth. They note that the name Evans points to Welsh origin, that Welsh means Gallic and Gallic French! Wit and irony abound in French

literature. It is just these qualities in George Eliot that the French critics insist upon. There is another quality that unexpectedly appeals to them. Emile Montégut found much of French realism, especially in Zola, brutal and sordid. Anatole France convicts Zola of the unpardonable sin of bad taste. Realism must be transpierced by an illumined imagination. Dostoievski did this in the Russian novel. It is the glory of George Eliot that she did it in Victorian England. Hence so many French critics have turned from Zola and Balzac and even Flaubert and welcomed the chastened and transfigured realism of George Eliot.

But have the Romieus discovered the real woman behind the novels ? They have given a vivacious and interesting and brilliant study ; yet they have not seen the whole woman. They are altogether admirable in the child scenes, the wooing of Lewes, the difficult ménage in Victorian England. They are far more just to Lewes than any English biographer. They do not discover all the secret motives that led George Eliot to marry Mr Cross. They see her readiness to cling like clematis. They do not recognize how independent the clinging woman could be. The real George Eliot had a hard, uncompromising, relentless intellect united to a quivering unstable emotional nature. She could do anything she set her hand to, but she loved to see her lover doing for her what she could well do for herself. The Romieus paint a flimsy woman in spite of her superb intellectual equipment. They have failed, and their failure is partly due to their inability to appreciate *Middlemarch*. No book is more characteristic of the mature author. It has all the qualities of the earlier novels together with that massive power which appears only in a Milton, a Leonardo, a Euripides. George Eliot was like the clematis in her affections : she was a stout English oak in her permanent self. We still wait for the biographer who will give us the complete woman.

CHARLES GARDNER.

The New Morality. By G. E. Newsom. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Ltd.). pp. 319. 6*s*.

Many conservative-minded people still believe that the tradition of reticence in matters of sex can and should be maintained. They would argue that the surroundings and influence of a good home are sufficient of themselves to protect their children as they grow up against the propaganda of the New Morality. Such persons underrate the perverse ingenuity of the attack on the family. They forget that no actually existing family attains in all respects to ideal perfection. A propaganda which ascribes every imaginable social or psychological evil to this or that aspect of family relationship will make headway unless more serious countervailing considerations are brought forward.

There has been of course plenty of sordid and sensational pulpit denunciation. We recollect the clergy of Silltown in *The Silver Gilt Standard* and conclude regretfully that the author did not need great powers of invention to describe the type. Of serious argument we have had two thoughtful books by Mr Kenneth Ingram. Now Mr Newsom brings heavier metal to bear in a book which is a running commentary on *Marriage and Morals* by Mr Bertrand Russell.

What is the New Morality? It is the contention that the separation between child-bearing and sexual activity, which has been made possible by mechanical devices, offers mankind an escape from the restrictions of traditional family life, restrictions which set up a condition of psychological strain which is the root cause of social evil.

The thesis is supported by anthropological and historical arguments. It is asserted that the original structure of human society was matrilineal. The famous Trobriand Islanders, who we are told perceive no connection between childbirth and sexual relationship, are acclaimed as the surviving relics of primitive society. The patriarchal family was invented by the cupidity of the male sex following upon the discovery of the fact of fatherhood. Adultery became a crime because it would imperil the rights of a father over his children regarded as his personal property.

Now comes the argument from history. The progress of civilization is said to bring with it inevitably a revival of polygamous impulses in both men and women, a distaste for family life, and a withering of the desire for children. The New Moralists are unique in finding their social ideal in the behaviour of the

wealthy classes of the early Roman Empire. They hope to avoid the racial suicide which is the doom of such a society by the expedient of paying large salaries to women selected as suitable for childbearing. The remaining population would be scientifically secured against the danger of procreation and free to engage in such sexual activity as it desired. Since the future of civilization is to be ruled by " Science " animated by no other motive than the will to power, " Free Love " will be the anæsthetic which alone can enable men to bear a life emptied of meaning and purpose.

We shall not be unduly optimistic if we believe that, in spite of the device of salaried parenthood, a nation which adopts the New Morality will give place to those which adhere to traditional standards. The ground for fear is lest such disintegrating beliefs should gain a hold among our own people.

There are circumstances which favour the new propaganda. Some of them are temporary. The superfluity of women in this generation through the lives lost in the war has seriously dislocated the structure of society. The social historian knows that war has ever been a solvent of moral restraints. It is not surprising that the greatest of recorded wars should have exercised an exceptionally grave disruptive influence. The disastrous effect of current psychological speculations must receive separate consideration.

More serious because more permanent in character is the problem raised by the floating population of the great industrial cities. Men and women on a scale hitherto unknown live their lives divorced from a normal background of family life and settled neighbourhood. It is this class which is especially exposed to the propaganda of the New Morality. The further parallel between the New Morality and the social philosophy of Bolshevism, which is drawn by Mr Newsom, can only be accepted with reservations. It is true that the Bolshevist doctrine of the Omnicompetent State can find no room for any independent, organic life of the family, and that marriage has been reduced to a contract terminable at will be either party. But, if so competent an observer as Mrs Sidney Webb is to be believed, the New Moralist's acquiescence in promiscuity is entirely repugnant to the austere fanaticism of the Soviet leaders. The League of Communist Youth tends to produce prigs rather than " free lovers."

Mr Newsom has excellent qualifications for writing as a

critic of the New Morality. It is all to the good that he is a much more enthusiastic admirer of such things as the Feminist Movement and the State educational machine than are the majority of his colleagues of the clergy. If his attitude strikes the reader as unduly complacent, it only serves to make it clearer that his attack on the New Morality is not simply part of a general disillusionment with modern life. He is at his best in his criticism of the biological, anthropological, and historical assumptions of the new doctrine. On the psychological implications of the theory he is less incisive. But it is here that the New Morality makes its appeal. Neither the pleasing innocence of the Trobriand Islanders nor the virtues of Messalina, but Dr Freud's Oedipus-complex and repressions give the movement its popular appeal. Many young people are as much afraid of complexes as are their aunts of bacilli or were their ancestors of evil spirits. Any attempt to discipline one's mind or body is to sow a rich crop of mental and moral disorders for the future. When the extravagances of the Freudian school have been abandoned, the chief intellectual support of the New Morality will be gone.

Mr Newsom is not only skilful in attack but candid in his defence of traditional morality. We children of the Reformation have always been in difficulties over the Christian exaltation of virginity. Sometimes it is quite unhistorically asserted to be a pagan accretion with no foundation in the New Testament. Even so able and fair a writer as Dr Edwyn Bevan in *Christianity* describes St. Paul's attitude to celibacy as part of an *interims-ethik* dependent on his immediate expectation of the End of the World. Since the whole moral teaching of the New Testament comes to us through writers who shared that expectation, this argument could be used against almost all their moral precepts. We answer that the fundamental meaning of Apocalyptic is that all the affairs and issues of this life must be decided against the background of eternity. Mr Newsom argues that the emphasis on virginity is due, not to any feeling that the life of sex is impure, but to a belief that certain persons have a heroic vocation to detachment from ordinary natural goods so as to be free for completely unencumbered service.

Mr Newsom quite rightly confesses that the weakness of the received morality lies in its acceptance of a double standard of conduct for men and women. Whatever has been the attitude of the official Christian Church, such an acquiescence has been

the mark of so-called Christian society. In England the double standard is not publicly defended. It is widely assumed in practice. In France and the countries of the French civilization it is assumed as axiomatic. Whatever may be the thought of the Women's Movement as a whole, it has made the double standard absurd. If men are not prepared to tolerate laxity in women, they must accept for themselves those standards which alone they find honourable in the other sex.

SHORT NOTICES.

Die drei Männer im Feuer. By CURT KUHL. (Töpelmann).

THIS fine piece of work is in the nature of a commentary on Dan. iii, which contains the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego being cast into the fiery furnace ; but it is much more than a commentary, for the notes contain a wealth of detail and information on an immense variety of subjects which suggest themselves through the study of the story. Although a book of less than 200 pages the learning which is packed into it is astonishing. Few readers could arise from perusing it without feeling that they had learned many things which were new to them. Unlike some German works of this scholarly character, it is easy reading ; Dr Kuhl's style is pleasant, he expresses himself clearly, and the arrangement of his subject-matter is masterly.

In a short review one can do no more than indicate a few points. Dr Kuhl, against commentators of a generation or two ago, and even some modern writers, rightly rejects any idea of the story being historical ; nor does he hold, again rightly we believe, that any substratum of fact underlies it. The story treats of a theme of which many forms exist, namely, the triumph of the martyr over the persecutor ; that more than justifies its existence ; it is, therefore, quite unnecessary to seek any historical basis for it.

With regard to the date of the composition of the story Dr Kuhl rejects both the older view that it was composed during the Babylonian period, as well as the modern one that it belongs to Maccabaean times ; in view of the large number of Persian words occurring in the story, as well as a certain number of Greek words, especially the enumeration of the musical instruments, he believes that it belongs to the late Persian period by which time Hellenic influence was already strongly asserting itself. He gives other reasons for his view, but this one is the most convincing.

Very interesting is the way Dr Kuhl shows how various elements in the story originate from different sources ; it would be impossible to deal with this here, but Dr Kuhl's treatment of the matter well illustrates the wide area over which he has conducted his investigations. One point may, however, be mentioned ; it is suggested that the idea of the three men being unharmed in the midst of the fire owes its origin to Isa. xlii, 3 :

> " When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee " (*cf.* Ps. lxvi, 12).

An important section deals with the additions to the story found in Theodotion's *Version of the Septuagint*, these Dr Kuhl believes, were originally written in Hebrew ; the illustrations of their re-translation into this language which he gives certainly bear out his contention, apart from other reasons adduced.

It is not possible in a short review to do full justice to this learned and inspiring work.

W.O.E.O.

Die Mischna : Dammai, Moed qatan, Qinnim. (Töpelmann).

THESE are three more tractates of the edition of the Mischna of Beer, Holtzmann, and Krauss. They are done by Bauer, Rapp, and Holtzmann, respectively. Of the outstanding excellence of earlier numbers of this work mention has been made before in the *Church Quarterly :* the same applies to those before us. They are not as important as some of the other tractates, but the many interesting notes are always valuable. In the Introduction to *Qinnim* Dr Holtzmann writes a very interesting article on a subject which most of us know little of, viz., Bird-sacrifice among the Jews ; birds never formed part of the public or communal sacrifices, they were only offered by private individuals ; but Holtzmann shows that this type of offering was very popular, and was one of the most frequent expressions of individual piety.

W.O.E.O.

St. Germaine of the Wolf Country. By HENRI GHÉON. Translated by F. J. SHEED. (Sheed and Ward, 1932). 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

M. HENRI GHÉON here retells the story of the Toulousaine shepherd-girl, Germaine Cousin, of Pibrac ; whose life ended at twenty, in the first year of the seventeenth century. She suffered, not only from congenital delicacy, but from its severe aggravation through the barbarous cruelty of the worst kind of step-mother and the incredible cowardice of her father. Starvation, with the stripping off of every other sort of comfort did not avail against Germaine's unalterable patience and charity. One human friend she had :

> " God presented her with a page-boy. He was a little shepherd-boy of thirteen, called Jeannot. . . . He brought Germaine poetry, and Germaine in return gave him a glimpse of Paradise."

Gossiping neighbours, the poltroon father, even the step-mother were, at length, one and all confounded before the miracles they could not deny or explain. On June 29, 1867, Pope Pius IX canonized her.

Mr Sheed has turned M. Ghéon into English. It is one more instance, not only of the general problem of translating one language into another, but of the impossibility of preserving in English the delicate *nuances* of that kind of simplicity which is peculiarly French. Our own modern colloquialism lacks the ingenuous spontaneity of our neighbours across the Channel.

G.H.

Church and Gnosis. By F. C. BURKITT. (Cambridge University Press). 6*s.* net.

Alexandrine Teaching on the Universe. By R. B. TOLLINTON. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd). 5*s.* net.

IT is convenient to notice these two books together, partly because they are both publications of lectures, but chiefly because the same idea lay at the back of the minds of both authors, prompting the choice of subject, and dictating the form of the books. The one

audience, Dr Burkitt's, was American, the other, Dr Tollinton's was English. In neither case could the lecturer assume that he was addressing scholars with an expert knowledge of second century philosophy. In both cases it was fair to assume that those who listened—and now those who read—had some knowledge of the history of thought and some interest in the speculations of thinkers at the beginning of the Christian era. Both authors give good reasons why this interest should exist to-day and why it is worth our while to go back to Alexandria when we are faced with problems which seem peculiarly our own. Both authors make it possible for us to do so, without special and unusual learning. They address the educated man, not necessarily a specialist, and appeal to those capable of thought, even if not trained in philosophy. This is the value, a real value, of both books.

Dr Burkitt states thus his purpose in writing :

> " How are we to conserve the value of the ' treasure,' seeing that the ' earthen vessels ' in which it was first stored are so unsuitable, and in some cases worn out and broken by the lapse of time ? "

Since the men of the second century were faced by essentially the same problem he thinks it worth while to study their attempts at solution, especially those of the Gnostics, whom he emphatically insists in regarding as Christians, though heretical. Indeed they are scarcely heretics, if heretics are those who leave the highway of Catholic doctrine. In the days of the Gnostics there was no such highway. What they did, as Dr Burkitt notes with striking clearness, was to wander off into regions, where, as it turned out afterwards, the road when built did not go.

Dr Tollinton's subject is wider. He does not confine himself to Gnostic speculation, though he includes it, but takes in all Alexandrian thought from the first century B.C. to the beginning of the third century A.D. thus including in his view such men as Philo, Clement, Origen and Plotinus, as well as Valentinus, who was perhaps not strictly Alexandrian.

But the true theme of both books is the same. In such ways these men faced the problems which we face to-day. Such and such were their solutions, such and such their lines of thought. They built upon a foundation of knowledge, scientific knowledge, far narrower and less secure than ours. But they possessed minds equal to ours, in pure speculation superior to ours, and sincerity of purpose which we may well envy and strive to emulate.

Both books are interestingly written, and, unlike many others of their kind, will be read with pleasure.

J.O.H.

I. *Christianity in Celtic Lands.* By Dom Louis Gougaud. (London. Sheed & Ward, 1932).

II. *The Columban Church.* By Dr John A Duke. (Oxford University Press, 1932).

I

The learned author of this excellent book has endeavoured with no little success, to give a comparative historical survey of Celtic Christianity in the relation of the early Celtic Churches to each other, in the West, in the Islands, and on the Continent of Europe.

A large part of the book is naturally devoted to Ireland (from the fifth century) which St. Patrick found generally pagan, with a slight sprinkling of Christian missionaries.

Since Professor Stokes wrote twenty-five years ago his fascinating *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, and broke down

> " the mischievous and ignorant opinion that the inhabitants of Ireland were simple barbarians, prior to the invasion of Strongbow,"

many scholars and writers have turned further attention to the Island of Saints, and Dom Louis Gougaud gives a list of " Sources," authors cited, covering no less than thirty-eight pages, a useful and valuable bibliography.

There are two most interesting chapters on " The Britons in Armorica," and " The Irish Abroad."

In consequence of the Anglo-Saxon invasion, Britons were compelled to emigrate, and the majority of the immigrants landed on the coasts of Brittany.

About the year A.D. 470, twelve thousand Britons arrived in the country lying north of the Loire, chiefly from Devon and Cornwall (Dumnonia).

But from Wales came the most famous founders of Breton Christianity, as for example, St. Samson, founder of the great and powerful monastery of Dol, which three centuries later struggled with the Popes for its own ecclesiastical supremacy.

The Celts have ever been pioneers of travel, and the constant and far-reaching journeys of Irish monks throughout Europe witness to strong missionary zeal attached to love of adventure. St. Columban and St. Gall, and a host of others exercised a great influence abroad, in many countries.

Not without humour three sections in this chapter have the following headlines :—" Wastrels of the Emigration," " Pilgrims and Sham-Pilgrims," " Doubtful Irishmen and Pseudo-Irishmen," and this last description might find a parallel in modern Irish political history.

A long chapter is devoted to the intellectual culture of the Irish medieval monks and the high standard of teaching in their monasteries ; their Biblical knowledge in particular—

> " the thought of the early Irish Christians was impregnated with the Bible, and their religious literature affords striking testimony to the fact."

Their wonderful care in transcribing the Scriptures, and the beautiful illuminated manuscripts are well-known.

Celtic contribution to Christian arts is the subject of a lengthened dissertation on Architecture and Sculpture, from the remarkable

bee-hive monastic cells on the Skelligs to the Celtic Romanesque of Cormac's Chapel on the Rock of Cashel, a range of 800 years at least.

The fine Irish metal, wood, and leather work is also considered. But the origin of Irish art remains an unsolved mystery of that which the author himself elsewhere describes as the "mirage oriental."

There are a few pages on Celtic music, chiefly in reference to the use of the harp, and the chanting of liturgical offices, of which the method is unknown.

The author says there is no evidence that the Gregorian chant was developed.

As to the impression made, he might have cited (but does not) *The Colloquy of Oisín and Patrick* in which these lines occur :—

"I have heard music sweeter far
Than hymns and psalms of clerics are ;
The blackbird's pipe on Letterlea,
The Dord Finn's wailing melody.

even

"The barque's sharp grating on the shore
Than cleric's chants delights me more."

It is well perhaps, to say that this book is not a work in which imagination outstrips the facts of history, as too often the case in presenting the romantic story of the Celts. It is rather, a valuable critical study of the earliest Western Churches and a fitting contribution to the 1500th Anniversary of St. Patrick.

The author concludes with this aphorism,

"The historian must never be weary of searching the past ; but let him beware of believing that he can explain all its mysteries."

Least of all, we add, the elusive mystery of the Celtic people.

II.

Although Dr Duke says in his Preface that

"many books have been written about St. Columba, but that there is no special critical work upon the Columban Church,"

it is difficult to agree that much new ground is discovered in this book, about half of which is taken up with Christianity before St. Columba followed by a life of the saint.

To the subsequent Columban Church, so-called, are then assigned twenty pages, and the rest of the book to the Decline of the Columban Church, its organization and customs, and its struggle for independence.

At the same time it is fair to add that the story is very well told, and that students of the period will find this a useful work for reference.

P.A.M.S.

The Letters of Queen Victoria 1886–1901 : *The Last Years* 1896–1901. Edited by GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE. (John Murray). 25*s.* net.

THE volume now before us completes the third and final series of Letters of Queen Victoria ; and the last extract from the Journal which is printed in it carries the reader to within ten days of her death.

Mr Buckle deserves the warmest congratulations and thanks for an achievement which is worthy alike of its subject and of his great ability and industry. He has raised a monument more enduring than bronze, and much more interesting, to " the most beloved, and one of the most renowned, of the long line of English Monarchs." He has furnished the historian of the future with an invaluable collection of side-lights on the eventful sixty years, by which he will be able to verify or correct official records and popular estimates. And, finally, for those readers who are more interested in human nature than in home or foreign politics, he has provided abundant material for a study of the effect of heredity and environment on a truly remarkable character. Even the most hardened Neogeorgian should be touched and impressed by the spectacle of the old Queen's indomitable will and almost undulled interest in life supporting the three-fold burden of the sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of her peoples, constant domestic anxiety and bereavement, and increasing age and bodily infirmity. The last years of her reign brought not only the inevitable sadness of one who had outlived her contemporaries and had to watch the successive gaps made by death among the younger members of the royal family and cousinship of which she was the honoured head, but national humiliations which weighed heavily on the spirit of the Queen. But to the very end she never lost her courage or her devotion to duty. The visit to Ireland in April, 1900, with its endless fatigues and its possibilities of danger was a miracle of self-control and energy, and throughout those trying days she kept in close touch with the Prime Minister and the War Office, and was constantly receiving and answering despatches on difficult and delicate questions connected with the clearing up after the South African war. The sense of responsibility and the lively interest appear clearly in her dealing with matters ecclesiastical. In such matters Queen Victoria would not have accepted patiently Sir Lewis Dibdin's view of the constitutional limitations of the Christian Prince. Anyone who wants to know exactly what was the Queen's mind about Crown Patronage should read carefully the pages 94 to 104, which cover the selection for a successor to Archbishop Benson at Canterbury ; and the reader need not, at this date, deny himself a respectful smile at the humorous side of the correspondence. The Queen's indignant denial of " partiality " for Dr Davidson, her argument that his health was quite strong enough for Canterbury, but not for London, her reluctant agreement that Canterbury should be offered to Dr Temple, and her frank annoyance when he accepted it, all these are points not to be missed : nor yet the velvet glove of Lord Salisbury's

suggestion that people would talk if Dr Davidson was sent to Canterbury at forty-eight. But perhaps the best point of all is that subsequent events showed that the Queen was right and Lord Salisbury wrong.

In quite another field subsequent events demand some reference to "Willy," now ex-Emperor of Germany, and the Queen's handling of her tiresome grandson. His successive emergences in these three last volumes show him in a progressively unfavourable light; and it needs only the wisdom of those who judge after the event, to trace in him the qualities and defects which led to catastrophe. That catastrophe seems to us as a great gulf fixed between us and the generations of which we read in these volumes. All the more are we indebted to Mr Buckle for helping us to understand, and, understanding, to do justice to the Victorian age and the royal lady who was in a great measure its ruler and its representative.

J.H.F.P.

Father Tyrrell and the Modernist Movement. By J. Lewis May. (Eyre & Spottiswoode). 10*s.* 6*d.*

Mr Lewis May, who is the biographer of Cardinal Newman, has written a learned and by no means sympathetic survey of the share taken by Father Tyrrell in the Modernist Movement. Naturally enough, he traces the pedigree of Modernism at least to Cardinal Newman, not to speak of more distant sources. The progress of the Oxford Movement from 1833 to 1845 was almost entirely in the direction of teaching the clergy to "magnify their office." The other part of the scheme, the combat against Liberalism, theological and political, fell quite into the background. The main reason for this was that during these years the theologians so completely dominated Oxford that Liberalism could hardly raise its head, and was despised as well as hated. If Newman could have foreseen the victory of his party, would he have remained in the Church of England? We cannot tell. His influence was disturbing and subtly disintegrating to every cause for which he laboured. Anglo-Catholicism and Modernism are among his bequests to the Church of England and to the Church of Rome respectively. If Tyrrell could have foreseen the victory of his party, would he have remained in the Church of England? There is reason, perhaps even strong reason, for thinking that he would, and we incline to believe that Mr May's pages supply us with such evidence. There is scarcely anything more fascinating than the if's of history.

What surprises us in this book is the want of sympathy displayed with George Tyrrell. What surprised us with the author's biography of John Henry Newman was the complete sympathy, and yet is it too much to say that, on the Modernist side at least, Newman is the spiritual father of Tyrrell? Nor does Modernism come off a whit better. This book opens with a criticism of the Modernist Movement, and not a little of the rest of it reads like a running

critical comment upon it ? In it we read that George Tyrrell was

> " driven to an attempt to reconcile two things that are not upon the same plane, that are incommensurable, to regulate spiritual truth by the standard of material fact."

But did Tyrrell ever really comtemplate such a reconciliation ? We entirely doubt it. There might be a natural law in the spiritual world for Henry Drummond : there was no such law for George Tyrrell. No one, we honestly believe, insisted more steadfastly than the Modernist upon the natural world and upon the spiritual world, and also upon the circumstance that the laws of the former did not in the least apply to the latter.

Those who have read Miss Petre's fine biography of Tyrrell have long since come to the conclusion that many of the views its subject propounded were forced upon him by the questions repeatedly addressed to him. In his history of the Oxford Movement, Dean Church has much to say about the influence of W. G. Ward upon the development of Cardinal Newman's thought. Ward was logical : Newman was illogical. Ward constantly asked Newman, " If you think so and so, surely you must also say something more." Newman was thus obliged to make each conclusion Ward drew, the basis of a fresh set of premises. The result was that the leader of the Oxford Movement advanced at a pace much more rapid than his natural one. When a thinker is in a state of doubt a questioner such as Ward, and the questioners such as those who besieged Tyrrell, not only forces him to resolve, but also by the persistence of his interrogatories raises additional difficulties.

> " There is no doubt," remarks Dean Church, " that Mr Newman felt the annoyance and unfairness of this perpetual question for the benefit of Mr Ward's theories, and there can be little doubt that, in effect, it drove him onwards and cut short his time of waiting. Engineers tell us that, in the case of a ship rolling in a sea-way, when the periodic times of the ship's roll coincide with those of the undulations of the waves, a condition of things arises highly dangerous to the ship's stability. So the agitations of Mr Newman's mind were reinforced by the impulses of Mr Ward's."

So the agitations of Mr Tyrrell's mind were reinforced by the impulses of many questioners, not least among them being Baron von Hügel. The latter was remorseless in the pertinacity with which he plied the mind of the Modernist. Considerations such as this might have left a deeper mark on Mr May's writing. For Tyrrell was no mere speculator, endlessly asking questions. On the other hand, he was a speculator who was endlessly being questioned, and the effects of these queries can easily be witnessed in his writings.

On Tyrrell the Modernist we glean but little, in spite of the title of this book : of Tyrrell the man we glean much, and for what we glean we feel distinctly grateful to Mr May. His book has stirred us beyond our wont, and perhaps this is to be reckoned to the credit of the author.

R.H.M.

The Italian Reformers, 1534–1564. By Frederic C. Church. (Oxford University Press). 31*s*.

Much has been published on the German, French, and English reformers, but little on the Italian, and accordingly we extend a warm welcome to the volume Mr Church has produced. His bibliography and his footnotes, especially the latter, attest the width of his reading, though here and there he has missed obvious writings, *e.g.*, in the fourth section dealing with histories of toleration. More generally, we wish that the fashion of commenting upon the worth or the worthlessness of the works in a bibliography was more prevalent than it is. We all of course have our own sense of their value, yet it is good to see what an author thinks of them when he is working from such a special angle as Mr Church. We ought to add that he has not only searched contemporary and modern books but he has also carefully consulted various periodicals to which he is indebted. In fact, we started our perusal of his learned volume with considerable confidence and when we had finished it we realized that our confidence had been justified. The author is wise enough to set out with a background sufficient to allow the general reader to grasp the position of affairs from 1534 to 1564, and the rivalry between Hapsburg and Valois receives its due place. Behind the two Houses stand Charles V and Francis I, and both sovereigns are shrewdly appreciated. Charles V was at his best in middle life Francis I in early life. Resources, abilities, and statesmenship had been bestowed upon both men. Francis dissipated his resources, wasted his abilities, and his statemanship degenerated into cunning. Both were persecutors, but here at least, Charles was sincere. The latter persecuted men in the Netherlands and in Spain. In Germany he was tolerant because it suited his policy. He employed neither the rack nor the screw simply because he dare not. His position was insecure, and he had no mind to make it untenable. Moreover, a policy of toleration was certain to divide the princes who adhered to the Reformed faith. " Divide et impera " was one of his mottoes. Like Francis, he proved no friend to constitutional liberty. He weakened the Diet in Germany and he ruined the Cortes in Spain. " Heresy is encouraging ideas of liberty," he wrote to his daughter a few months before his death. How could he allow political freedom when he was resolved to put down religious ? For the presence of the freedom to serve God as conscience directs ultimately carries with it freedom to serve the State. Mr Church, therefore, is perfectly right in spending space in the analysis of the characters and the policy of these two sovereigns. After all, Charles V was the Holy Roman Emperor with jurisdiction of what we to-day call Italy but was then simply a geographical expression.

Throughout this volume we are conscious, thanks to the skill of the author, of the presence of the policies of Charles V and Francis I and of their paramount place in all that affected the Italian reformers. Nor is this influence merely confined to rulers : it also extends to reformers of all schools of thought. Mr. Church points out the actions and the reactions of, say, the Swiss school as led by Bullinger,

Pellikan, and Amberbach, and the south German school as led by Butzer.

The author lays just stress on the career of Vergerio, Bishop of Capodistria. The papal nuncio Visconti pronounced judgment upon Vergerio :

> " He has lost his high position in the Catholic world without acquiring the confidence of the Protestants, because he is a free-thinker ; and not adhering to Luther more than to Zwingli, has become suspect to all."

Mr Church holds that his legal training accounts for his support of the Augsburg Confession which seemed to him as to Amberbach the most conducive to the maintenance of the established order. In not a few ways he reminds us of Erasmus though of course of much smaller stature intellectually. On the other hand he plainly entertained a lofty opinion of himself and of his capacity, which stood much above that of many of his Italian contemporaries. He deferred to the rulers of this world, as Erasmus did, and for much the same reason. They both believed in a gradual improvement of the *status quo*, but in the meantime it was the *status quo*, and as such it must be respected. Vergerio did not for a moment believe in authority simply for its own sake, and accordingly he exhorted the Italian bishops not to be the tools of the pope's policy at the Council of Trent. Cantù's summary of him is that of a

> " thoroughly practical spirit, without ability to generalize, who treated religion as a juridical affair, citing the Bible like a codex, splitting hairs without any lofty purpose."

This is to us, an unfair summary, and we take it to mean that Cantù and Vergerio did not altogether see eye to eye.

Quite candidly, we are not much impressed by these Italian reformers who did not reach the level of the German, the French, and the English. Perhaps Lelio Sozini is an exception and of him we have a good account. When we have read and digested a volume like this, we can better understand why the Italian reformers failed to accomplish their direct purpose. Of the success of their indirect purpose there cannot be even a second opinion. For the reformers cleansed the Church of the type of priest drawn with pitiless fidelity by the novelist and the poet. The tragedy of the Reformation is that the Church of Rome was afforded opportunity after opportunity to set her house in order, and wilfully refused them all. Whatever else Mr Church has demonstrated, he has demonstrated this. She repudiated the Reformation, the more congenial and less violent reformation, of Savonarola. A wider, more complete Reformation—a Reformation on different principles—became more and more necessary. It was only by the reaction of the more formidable revolution of the north that the south at length conformed to some of the views of the reformer of Ferrara, Savonarola. In truth, the Roman Catholic Church owes a debt to the reformers only inferior to that of the Reformed Churches. Had Luther never lived, Loyola had never endured ; but for the Confession of Augsburg, the Council of Trent had not sat, that Council which, however fatal and irremediable the evil which it wrought by petrifying the opinions and

superstitions of the Middle Ages into doctrines, did infinite service to the discipline, to the decency, to the religion of the Roman Church. The clergy of the "Decameron" have disappeared, and this result is chiefly due to the preaching of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and the silent working of the seminaries and schools which the Council instituted. In fact, the Church of Rome herself quietly adopted much of the spirit, while anathematizing the tenets, of the reformers in general and of the Italian reformers in particular.

R.H.M.

Establishment in England; being Essays on Church and State. By Sir Lewis Dibden, D.C.L. (Macmillan & Co.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sir Lewis Dibden out of the abundance of his learning and experience has given to the Church and the World a most valuable and instructive collection of essays. His opinions carry the added weight not only of life-long service to the Church of England but of the fact that they represent with singular clearness and erudition the mind of a large and influential section of the Laity. Like the scribe in the Gospel he brings forth out of his treasure things new and old: as he tells us in the Preface, forty-nine years lie between the first of these articles and the present day. The judicious reader, though he is occasionally brought up short by a tense which speaks of a more or less remote yesterday as if it were still to-day, will on the whole be glad of the perspective and of the opportunity of verifying or correcting the author's forecasts after the event. It is no ill compliment to Sir Lewis to say that the best thing in the book is the masterly historical survey of the relations between Church and State in which he collaborated with the late Master of Balliol. But every one of the papers is both timely and illuminating: and the book will come as a boon to such persons as in discussing questions of Church Establishment are anxious to know what they are talking about. In matters of fact and law Sir Lewis may be taken as a safe guide. It is more difficult to follow him when he virtually identifies Parliament as at present constituted with the Christian Prince, and argues that so long as the Archbishop crowns the Sovereign, and prayers are said by an Anglican Chaplain at the beginning of the sitting, Mr Saklatvala has a right to the last word on the doctrine and ritual of the Church of England.

Sir Lewis' remarks on the Church Assembly are frank and refreshing. It is remarkable that in describing its constitution he should have ignored the existence of Deans and Archdeacons.

J.H.F.P.

Mysticism, East and West: A Comparative analysis of the Nature of Mysticism. By Rudolf Otto, Professor of Theology in the University of Marburg. Translated by Bertha L. Bracey and Richenda C. Payne. (Macmillan & Co.) 16*s.* net.

A reviewer need not challenge this title taken by itself, though,

with the sub-title, and with Professor Otto's definite opening statement in the foreword—

> This book attempts to penetrate the nature of that strange spiritual phenomenon which we call mysticism, by comparing the two principal classic types of Eastern and Western mystical experience—

it cannot be accepted as accurately describing the book's contents. Readers of Abbot Butler's *Western Mysticism* will remember how carefully, in his Prologue, he discussed the nature of mysticism, defining its limits. Professor Otto lets this difficult point go by him, as he writes of " that strange spiritual phenomenon which we call mysticism," until he arrives, rather late in the day, at p. 141, where he would have made his argument about the hymn of Gregory of Nyssa clearer had he recalled Abbot Butler's reminder that in the West " the old word contemplation held its own until the later Middle Ages, and ' mysticism ' is quite a modern word." We, too often are so diversely minded about the nature and limits of mysticism, that every serious book should explain, however briefly, the author's precise connotation of the term. Again, Abbot Butler remarked, in his Summary of Part I, that his title

> is taken as being something different from, as being a particular phase of, mysticism in the West. This latter would be a much wider and more difficult subject.

This he follows with a lucid account of the characteristics of Western Mysticism, in this narrower sense :

> While fully recognizing the surpassing elevation and the supreme value and interest of St. Augustine's presentation of his mystical experience, it is pre-eminently to the mysticism of Cassian, Gregory and Bernard that I venture to give the name of Western Mysticism.

Professor Otto, however, assumes the meaning of Eastern and Western more untroubledly even than that of mysticism.

His book as it stands is a comparison of two thinkers—(comparison and contrast) :

> from the East the great Indian Acharya Sankara, and from the West the great German Meister Eckhart.

Whether Orientalist experts will accept the first as *typical* they must decide : but it is indeed surprising to find Eckhart proffered as the " principal classic type " of Western mystical experience. While it is doubtful if students of Christian mystics would choose any one as the principal classic type—Abbot Butler in a definitely narrower connection selected four—it is certain that Eckhart would not be chosen as representative : rather he is singular, almost unique ; whatever he is, he is not typical.

As a study of these two men's likenesses and contrasts, the book is interesting : but those who are competent through expert knowledge of Sanskrit to judge this handling of Sankara, and proficient enough in Eckhart's works, either in the original or in Mr C. de B. Evans' recently published Translation, to appraise Professor Otto's work adequately must, among us, be few in number. Yet the less well equipped of us, while their partial knowledge may not seldom

lead them to disagree with this or that of his claims—and so undermine their reliance on him where they are still less expert—can still, if they will take trouble, garner some ears from his sheaves. Part I is devoted to the likenesses, Part II to the dissimilarities of the two men : both are numerous, and often, in Professor Otto's exposition, at any rate, so bafflingly complicated that no brief review can even indicate, let alone discuss, them. In passing, we may note a single instance of the difficulty he adds by unusual phrases. Telling the story of the old Sage who left his two wives and all his possessions to seek salvation, he says of one wife, " Maitreyi did not need to seek an empirical immortality." Some readers might like to be told what an immortality not experienced really means.

The book is provocative of much, of many thoughts : *e.g.* on p. 31, in what, with its references to " rapturous states " and the " bridal chamber " looks like an attack upon St. Bernard, Professor Otto writes :

> The special character of the mysticism of both masters, is that of an intellectual not an emotional mysticism.

Apart from the question whether this represents the whole Eckhart, whom, further on, Professor Otto calls

> the climbing spirit of a Gothic soul, striving after an " end " which is yet never an end,

is a capital instance of that knack, so productive of philosophical and religious difficulties, of propounding as alternatives what are false antitheses ; false too in that most misleading way, because not mutually exclusive but vital parts of a not yet constructed, perhaps with our present capacities not constructable, synthesis. Intellect and feeling ! when will it be generally perceived that both are essential to full comprehension of the things which matter most ? Is it not just that truth which is implicit in St. Paul's exordium on love, partly accounting for his sudden passage from *caritas nunquam excidit* to *videmus nunc per speculum in enigmate ?* The true " two ways " to knowledge are there, feeling and understanding, however " riddling " the latter may appear. No matter how Professor Otto may protest, no matter how readily we may admit that some mystics have fallen into emotional excess, we never can forget that to a St. Augustine, a St. Bernard, a Richard Rolle, a St. Teresa, Love is the great enlightener. When shall we follow even the shrewd old Montaigne and cease to " cut a man in half ? "

The upshot then is that this book is for experts in the whole history and practice of Mysticism, for them, who perhaps alone can use it safely, first.

To general readers, whatever those may be, more explicitly, to people who have made no more study of theology in its various ways, than, let us say they have in physics or any other matter on which they would hesitate to dogmatize in ignorance, to them it will assuredly bring confusion. To the half and half, if they may be with so little ceremony so styled, it, as has been said, will bring points of interest and suggestion.

All alike, scholars partly, the rest wholly, will regret the astonish-

ing omission in the English Edition of an Alphabetical Glossary of the multitude of Sanskrit words peppered over the pages (each translated only on its first appearance); also of Indices, one of persons, the other of subject matters. G. H.

Lyra Mystica. An Anthology of Mystical Verse edited by C. C. Albertson. Introduction by the Dean of St. Paul's. lvi + 496 pp. (Macmillan).

The earliest poem came from Egypt in 3000 B.C. and there are ten pages only containing poems from the pre-Christian era, and eight pages of poems from the first ten centuries A.D. One hundred pages contain nineteenth century writers. Two hundred and sixty pages are devoted to the work of poets who were living in 1900 and of these, one hundred and sixty-five pages to the work of contemporaries. The editor has gone to many unconventional sources and the result is a most catholic selection full of surprises.

D.C.D.

A Professional Christian. By J. C. Hardwick. (Jonathan Cape). 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

This (to adapt a phrase from a recent number of the *Church Quarterly*) is a thoroughly vulgar book. The sensitive reader's teeth are set on edge when he reads on the first page that the hero

> " had the thick hair, the thick hands and the fleshy face of a member of the proletariat : "

and the writer displays throughout what he himself calls " the you-be-damned insolence of the aristocrat," thanking God from page to page that he is not as other men are. His novel is likely to afford considerable entertainment to Roman Catholics and other persons who do not admire the Church of England, for it seems to be inspired by dislike and contempt for that Church and all its ways and members, lay and clerical : and people can be forgiven if they are amused at seeing a bird not of their feather fouling its own nest.

Mr Hardwick can do nothing but sneer savagely, and often dully, at anyone and anything connected with *L'Infame.* He sneers at bishops, they are commercial-minded and easily duped ; Anglo-Catholics, are all dishonest and on the make, and their beliefs are just " Scollands Church nonsense " ; Evangelicals are credulous and emotional ; even Modernists are sometimes guilty of considering other people's feelings ; incumbents are generally futile ; curates are hack-curates unless they make their Vicar's life a burden ; and the devout laity are beneath contempt. It is all very bitter and very cheap and snobbish. The bitterness may be partly due to the fact that Mr Hardwick is obsessed by the delusion that Modernists are excluded from preferment. But he really need not have given us the venerable chestnut about the Elevation of the Alms-dish ; or repeated almost in the same words on page 289 the silly story of the Verger, the Choirmen and the Communion wine which has already appeared on page 138. J.H.F.P.

The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason. With Introduction and Notes by the late Ernest Pearce; edited by Leonard Whibley. (Cambridge University Press. 1932). 10s. 6*d*.

The works of Dr Pearce are mostly concerned with the Middle Ages, but he was always spiritually at home in the eighteenth century. As Bishop of Worcester he spent many happy hours in the Hurd Library of Hartlebury Castle—that beautiful monument of Georgian culture and learning—and it is fitting that this book should begin with a picture of Dr Pearce standing by the bookshelves with an open Quarto in his hands.

Soon after the publication of his *History of Hartlebury Castle*, a firm of Worcester solicitors handed over to him a mass of papers that had once belonged to Bishop Hurd and they are now stored in a bureau that was his, just outside the Library which he built. Among the papers were the letters now published. Dr Pearce was preparing them for publication when he died. His work has been completed by Mr Whibley; and few books have been better edited or more appropriately produced.

It is true that there is nothing of first-rate importance in these letters. They have not the impressiveness of Johnson, the sparkle of Walpole, or "the divine chit-chat" of Cowper, but they are all readable, written *currente calamo* in good eighteenth century prose by cultivated and interesting men. As we read these letters we may reflect on the superiority of education in Georgian times. In these days of speed and specialization we should not expect a Bishop to be able to give a reference to Athenœus without rising from his chair to verify it. How many modern Bishops are competent to compare French and Italian poets, while also able to write about Hume and Bolingbrooke, take part in the theological controversies of a pundit like Warburton, and pronounce infallible judgments on the niceties of language in the composition of a sonnet. The most unexpected quotation in these letters are two stanzas from the early poems of Sir Thomas More. "A rude Enditer," says the Bishop, "But can you direct me to better sense or sprucer English?"

Hurd and Mason were literary clergymen, but they at any rate tried to put first things first. When Mason undertook clerical work he almost decided on Warburton's advice to burn his Lyre. When Hurd accepted a country living he announced that in future he should restrict himself to professional studies. Their inclinations were too strong for them to make the sacrifice complete, but they were conscientious about fulfilling such obligations as the eighteenth century recognized.

It has been the fashion to represent Hurd as a Toady and a Climber. These letters at any rate do not confirm such a view. Neither does the splendid portrait of Gainsborough reproduced in this volume. There we see a severe proud man—the sort of man who because he respects himself so much is punctilious in showing respect for others. If Hurd was the enthusiastic young friend of Warburton and later the favourite Bishop of George III, his admiration for Warburton was perfectly genuine, and his friendship with the king gave him the chance of refusing the See of Canterbury.

H.M.S.

Periodicals

The Churchman (Vol. XLVI. No. 3. July, 1932. London, E.C. 4: Dean Wace House). The Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen. C. M. Chavasse: The Centrality of the Cross. W. W. Cash: Conversion. J. W. Harvey: Professor Rudolf Otto and 'The Idea of the Holy.' J. W. Oman: The Abiding Significance of the Apocalyptic. A. J. Macdonald: Professor Karl Barth and the Theology of Crisis. G. F. G. Brown: The Grace of God. J. Thornton-Duesbery: Dr Frank Buchman and the Group Movement. J. Knipe: The Conversion of Simon Fish, II. W. Howard-Flanders 'The Church of England and her Reformations' (critical). Aulén 'Christus Victor.' A. J. M[acdonald]: W. K. Jordan 'The Development of Religious Toleration in England' (favourable); Greenaway 'Arnold of Brescia' ('scholarly yet readable'); McConnachie 'The Significance of Karl Barth'; Warfield 'Calvin and Calvinism.' McGiffert 'History of Christian Thought, I.' Hague 'Through the Prayer Book.' Macdonald 'Hildebrand (Gregory VII)' (laudatory). Buttrick 'Jesus came Preaching' ('of real merit'). Addison 'The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722–1930' (favourable).

The Congregational Quarterly (Vol. X. No. 3. July, 1932. London, E.C. 4: Memorial Hall). A. E. Garvie: Christ's Lordship in the Social Order. A. M. Chirgwin: Madagascar as a Mission Field. The Younger Generation. W. G. Moore: Hymns in Modern Worship. A Lay View. F. Smith: The Quintessence of Dust. A. E. Harper: Alfred Williams. An Appreciation. M. Spencer: The Obsoleteness of Ministerial Training. L. Beaumont: Our Churches To-day. M. Townley: The Sunday School Dramatic Society. W. H. Jacobsen: Sunday. A. Peel: 'The Standard Edition of the Works of Bernard Shaw' (5 pp.) A. E. Garvie: Stokes 'Satyakama or True Desires' (4½ pp.). W. B. Selbie: Marett 'Faith, Hope, and Charity in Primitive Religion'; Hartmann 'Ethics, I–II'; Strecker and Appel 'Discovering Ourselves.' R. Mackintosh: Tennant 'Philosophy of the Sciences.' R. S. Franks: Boyce Gibson 'The Philosophy of Descartes'; Lion 'The Idealistic Conception of Religion'; Sikes 'Peter Abailard' ('a real contribution to our knowledge').

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought (Vol. IX. No. 2. March–May, 1931. Toronto: 73 Queen's Park). W. H. Sedgwick: Prof. R. A. Falconer at Pine Hill. M. W. Wallace: Sir Robert Falconer as President of the University of Toronto. E. A. Dale: Some Aspects of Sir Walter Scott. G. W. Richards: Zwingli's Pathway to Certainty. F. H. Underhill: Canada and International Peace. K. Naylor: The Pioneer and the Church. J. Lowe: Arnold Meyer and the Epistle of James. S. M. Gilmour: Scott 'The Kingdom of God in the N.T.' R. B. Y. Scott: McFadyen 'The Message of Israel.' J. W. Falconer: Howard 'The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation.' J. Macleod: Troeltsch 'The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches.' W. Maxwell: McMillan 'The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church, 1550–1638.' D. J. Wilson: Weatherhead 'Psychology in the Service of the Soul.' J. Lowe: Malaval 'A Simple Method of Raising the Soul to Contemplation.' C. A. Krug: Schiller 'Die Absolutheit des Christentums.' J. Line: Otto 'Mysticism East and West.' W. W. Bryden: Bennett 'A Philosophical Study of Mysticism' (favourable). K. H. Cousland: Rowe 'History of the Christian People.' F. J. Moore: Needham 'The

Great Amphibium.' D. J. Wilson: Richards 'Behaviour Aspects of Child Conduct.'

Laudate (Vol. X. No. 38. June, 1932. Burnham, Bucks: Nashdom Abbey). W. S. Porter: Early Spanish Monasticism. II. Isidor of Seville and his Rule. F. B. Andrews: Pershore Abbey. Some Chapters on its Foundation and History (*concluded*). The XII Apostles and the Gentiles, III. R. H. Thouless: Pastoral Psychology. Dom A. Hughes: Mediaeval Music. A New Development. Ven. J. H. F. Peile: Belloc 'Cranmer.' Osuna 'The Third Spiritual Alphabet' (4¼ pp.). Oman 'The Natural and the Supernatural.' E. O. James: MacCulloch 'Mediaeval Faith and Fable.' Garstang 'The Foundations of Bible History. Joshua–Judges' (3 pp.). Husserl 'Ideas.' H. Thomas: Charles 'Courage, Truth, Purity.' C. E. Faithfull: Joseph 'Some Problems in Ethics' ('important'); Field 'Plato and his Contemporaries.' Stebbing 'A Modern Introduction to Logic.' J. C. Pringle: Kenyon (ed.) 'The Catholic Faith and the Industrial Order' (critical). Camm 'Nine Martyr Monks.' Ward (ed.) 'Newman's Apologia Pro Vita Sua, the two Versions of 1864 and 1865.'

The Baptist Quarterly (Vol. VI. No. 3. July, 1932. London, W.C. 1: 4 Southampton Row). D. Glass: The Barthian Idea of Revelation. H. W. Robinson: Personal Evangelism. T. P. George: Experiments I have made. III. The Morning Service. F. Beckwith: The Early Church in Leeds, II. S. J. Price: (1) Dissenting Academies, 1662–1820; (2) Peck 'Reunion and Nonconformity.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 513. July, 1932. John Murray). Sir L. T. Dibdin: Doctors' Commons. L. J. Stanley: The German Republic and the Extremists. E. H. C. Oliphant: The Shakespeare Canon. D. B. Lloyd: The World and Mr Wells. J. P. Collins: The Decline of Illustration. Dame U. Pope-Hennessy: Sir Walter Scott. E. Jenks: The Statute of Westminster, 1931. Sir J. Marriott: Garibaldi. A. Waugh: Authors, Publishers and the Public. E. J. Dillon: The Spanish Republic and its Problems. Visct. Cranborne: Conservatism and the National Government. Salter 'Recovery. The Second Effort.' Dietz 'The Story of Science.' Maharajah of Burdwan 'The Indian Horizon.' Conway 'Henry VII's Relations with Scotland and Ireland, 1485–98.' Wilcken 'Alexander the Great.' Evans 'Warburton and the Warburtonians.' Benson 'Charlotte Brontë.' Lafourcade 'Swinburne.'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XLVII. No. 187. July, 1932. Longmans). H. M. Cam: Manerium cum Hundredo. The Hundred and the Hundredal Manor. H. G. Richardson and G. Sayle: The King's Ministers in Parliament, 1272–1377. III. The Parliaments of Edward III. K. L. Wood-Legh: The Knights' Attendance in the Parliaments of Edward III. N. Sykes: Episcopal Administration in England in the XVIIIth Century. A. L. Poole: Henry Plantagenet's Early Visits to England. A. E. Stamp: Richard II and the Death of the Duke of Gloucester. J. M. Clark: John Bischoff's Prologue. K. M. Lea: Sir Anthony Standen and some Anglo-Italian Letters. Z. N. Brooke: Holtzmann 'Papsturkunden in England, I–II' (laudatory). F. M. Stenton: Brooke 'The English Church and the Papacy' (3 pp.). C. Johnson: Foster 'The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, I.' J. E. Lloyd: Griscom 'The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth' (3 pp.). E. W. Watson: Hartridge 'History of Vicarages in the Middle Ages' ('really useful'). H. J. Pybus: Kantorowicz 'Frederick II, 1194–1250.' F. M. Powicke: 'Testa de Nevill, II.' (3 pp.). W. D. Green: Bridge 'History of France, III-IV, 1498–1514.' B. Williams: Sedgwick 'Hervey's Memoirs of the

Reign of George II.' Sir G. Hurst: Fremantle 'England in the XIXth Century, 1806–10.' E. L. Woodward: Soltau 'French Political Thought in the XIXth Century.' Z. N. B[rooke]: Evans 'Monastic Life at Cluny, 910–1157' (critical). C. J[ohnson]: Denholm-Young 'Cartulary of the Medieval Archives of Christ Church.' A. H. T[hompson]: Wilkinson 'The Medieval Council of Exeter.' E. R. A[dair]: Noyes 'Military Obligation in Medieval England' (very critical). De Beer 'Early Travellers in the Alps' ('exceptionally well illustrated'). Jones 'The English Revolution, 1603–1714' (critical). E. W. W[atson]. Palmer 'Episcopal Visitation Returns for Cambridgeshire.' King 'Notes on the Catholic Liturgies' (critical).

Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research (Vol. X. No. 28. June, 1932. Longmans). J. F. Willard: 'The Dating and Delivery of Letters Patent and Writs in the XIVth Century.' G. Pollard: 'The Bibliographical History of Hall's Chronicle.' The Accessibility of Archives, XXXII. New Zealand. A. F. Pollard: 'A Changeling Member of Parliament.' Brooke 'The English Church and the Papacy.' Greenaway 'Arnold of Brescia.' Beardwood 'Alien Merchants in England, 1350–77.' Butterfield 'The Whig Interpretation of History.' Summaries of Theses. The Dictionary of National Biography [Corrections and Additions]. Historical MSS. A. Accessions. B. Migrations.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester (Vol. XVI. No. 2. July, 1932. Manchester University Press). H. B. Charlton: The Taming of the Shrew. R. S. Conway: The Etruscan Influence on Roman Religion. C. H. Dodd: The Gospel Parables. H. J. Fleure: An Early Chapter of the Story of 'Homo Sapiens.' E. F. Jacob: Two Lives of Abp. Chichele. E. M. Thompson: A Fragment of a Witham Charterhouse Chronicle and Adam of Dryburgh, Premonstratensian and Carthusian of Witham. T. Fish: Letters of the First Babylonian Dynasty. T. Murgatroyd: List of Current Periodical Publications, including Transactions of Learned Societies, in the John Rylands Library.

Theology (Vols. XXIV–XXV. Nos. 144–6. June–August, 1932. S.P.C.K.). Some Letters of Dr Arnold, I (II. July). A. C. Dixon: The Four Gospels and the Three Denials. R. Kenyon: Two Studies in the Social Outlook of the Tractarians. I. Newman (II. July. Keble and Pusey). A. J. Macdonald: The Message and Theology of Barth and Brunner, III. R. E. Balfour: Vicissitudes of Catholicism in Modern France, III. W. R. V. Brade: Beevor (ed.) 'Catholic Sermons' (3 pp.). Claude Jenkins: Sikes 'Peter Abailard.' W. J. Ferrar: Griffiths 'God in Idea and Experience.' T. H. Robinson: Rabbinowitz 'Mishnah Megillah.' A. Tillyard: Ingram (ed.) 'Youth looks at Religion' (critical). July. C. F. Nolloth: Tradition and Personal Experience. W. K. Lowther Clarke: 'The Dead are raised up.' An Interpretation. C. Harris: Woolley 'Exorcism and the Healing of the Sick' (3 pp.). A. Tillyard: Hynek 'Konnersreuth.' E. C. Ratcliff: Dalton 'The Psalms.' M. Trevelyan: Whiting 'Studies in English Puritanism, 1660–88.' K. D. Mackenzie: Peck 'Reunion and Nonconformity.' A. J. Macdonald: MacCulloch 'Medieval Faith and Fable.' T. W. Pym: Vidler 'Sex, Marriage and Religion.' W. J. Ferrar: F. E. Pollard 'Religion, Morals and the Intellect.' C. D. Waddams: Husserl 'Ideas.' H. P. V. Nunn: Grandmaison 'Jesus Christ, II.' T. H. Robinson: Buber 'Jewish Mysticism.' A. S. Cripps: McFadyen 'The Message of Israel.' M. Howse: Charles 'Courage, Truth, Purity.' W. J. Ferrar: Allen and McKay 'Tell John.' R. S. Cripps: Peake 'The Servant of Yahweh.' Claude Jenkins: Webb 'John of Salisbury.' August. A. A. Cock: Some Aspects of the Psychology of Conversion, I. Right Rev. M. J.

Carpenter-Garnier (Bishop of Colombo): A Problem in S. India. A Mason: The Last Supper. A Conjecture. D. M. Boycott: Charles Marriott, 1811–58. J. K. Mozley: A Note on Christology. F. P. Harton: Hardman (ed.) 'The Christian Life, II. Discipline.' R. M. Pope: Duckett 'Latin Writers of the Fifth Century.' A. J. Macdonald: Whitley (ed.) 'The Doctrine of Grace' (3⅜ pp.). C. A. Webster: Day 'The Cathedrals of the Church of Ireland.' F. W. Butler: Valentine 'Moral Freedom and the Christian Faith.' A. Nairne: 'James M. Wilson. An Autobiography.' R. H. Murray: Addison 'The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722–1930.' H. Northcott: Longridge 'A Monk's Retreat for Religious.' S. C. Carpenter: Douglas 'Constitutional Episcopacy.' C. F. Rogers: Walker 'Science and Revelation.' C. C. J. James: Man 'Christianity and the Cure of Disease.'

The Expository Times (Vol. XLIII. Nos. 9–11. June–August, 1932. T. and T. Clark). J. McConnachie: The Barthian School. III. Friedrich Gogarten, I (II. July). C. H. Dodd: The Framework of the Gospel Narrative. A. Guillaume: The Messiah in Judaism and Christianity (University Sermon). W. H. Beales: Building the Body of Christ. The Dream of the Cambridge Group Movement. J. Feather: The Princess who rescued Moses. Who was she? With Note on Heb. xi, 24–6. J. H. Michael 'The Actual Saying behind St. John vi, 62. C. C. Oke: Rev. viii, 9. J. E. M'Intyre: The Fiftieth Psalm. A Blast against Animal Sacrifice. McGiffert 'History of Christian Thought, I.' Ross 'Behaviour and Destiny.' Bevan 'Christianity.' Smith 'Studies in Early Mysticism.' Jordan 'Development of Religious Toleration.' Burkitt 'Church and Gnosis.' Duke 'The Columban Church.' July. J. Moffatt: Prof. B. W. Bacon. W. F. Lofthouse: Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel. J. P. Thornton-Duesbury: The Guidance of God. A Further Study of the Oxford Group Movement. (Aug. 'Sharing'). (The late) B. W. Bacon: 'In my Father's house are many mansions' (Jn. xiv, 2). 'Youth and Life.' Welch 'Deuteronomy.' Dodd 'Romans.' Harton 'Elements of the Spiritual Life.' Dibdin 'Establishment in England.' Glover 'Greek Byways.' Smith 'Synoptic Tables' (laudatory). August. V. Taylor: The Barthian School, IV. Rudolf Bultmann. N. MacNicol: Mysticism East and West. W. M. Christie: Did Christ eat the Passover with His Disciples? or, The Synoptics versus John's Gospel. J. W. Jack: Recent Biblical Archaeology. W. H. Stubbs: Robinson Crusoe as the Prodigal Son. Brinton 'The Peace Army.' Fosdick 'As I see Religion.' Welch 'The Preparation for Christ in the O.T.' J. Moffatt: Franz 'Goethe als religiöser Denker.' Volker 'Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes' (laudatory).

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. XXVIII. No. 3. July, 1932. Louvain: 40 rue de Namur). G. Bardy: Les Écoles romaines au Second Siècle. J. Cottiaux: La Conception de la Théologie chez Abélard, II. J. Gessler: Le Droit d'Arsin dans l'ancienne Principauté de Liege. L. Cerfaux: 'L'Histoire de la Tradition synoptique' d'après Rudolf Bultmann. J. M. Frochisse: A propos des Origines du Jeûne Eucharistique. L. Cerfaux: Harnack 'Studien zur Geschichte des N.T., I. Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik.' A. Gathy: Delling 'Paulus Stellung zu Frau u. Ehe'; Turmel 'Histoire des Dogmes, I (4 pp.). R. Maere: Aubert (ed.) 'Nouvelle Histoire Universelle de l'Art, I'; Clasen 'Die Gotische Baukunst' (4 pp.); Friedlaender 'Die altniederländische Malerei, IX. J. Lebon: Klostermann-Benz 'Zur Ueberlieferung der Matthäuserklärung des Origenes'; Bardenhewer 'Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, V.' D. van den Eynde: Völker 'Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes.' N. Balthasar: Brosch 'Der Seinsbegriff bei Boethius.' L. Gougaud: Walberg 'La Tradition Hagiographique de S. Thomas Becket avant la

Fin du XIIe Siècle.' G. Mollat: Fink 'Die Stellung des Konstanzer Bistums . . . im Zeitalter des avignonesischen Exils.' A. Fliche: Jung 'Alvaro Pelayo'; Calmette-Périnelle 'Louis XI et l'Angleterre.' P. Richard: Castagnoli 'Il Cardinale Giulio Alberoni, II.' A. Janssens: Beckmann 'Die Katholische Missionsmethode in China (1842–1912).

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Vol. XXII. No. 2. April–June 1932. Bern: Stämpfli & Cie). C. Neuhaus: Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen den orthodoxen Kirchen des Morgenlandes und der Kirche von England' (34 pp.). R. Keussen: Die Willensfreiheit als religiöses u. philosophisches Grundproblem, II. Zur Lehre von der Gnade.

Africa (Vol. V. No. 3. July, 1932. Milford). J. W. C. Dougall: Characteristics of African Thought. M. J. Herskovits: Some Aspects of Dahomean Ethnology (31 pp., illustrated). W. Eiselen: Ueber die Häuptlingswürde bei den Bapedi. J. C. de G. Johnson: The Fanti Asafu. A. M. Chirgwin: Christian Literature in Africa. O. Eriksson: Education in Abyssinia. B. Zuure: Poésies chez les Barundi. Reviews.

The International Review of Missions (Vol. XXI. No. 83. July, 1932, Milford). The Missionary Significance of the Last Ten Years. A Survey (*concluded*). S. Baudert: Zinzendorf's Thought on Missions related to his Views of the World. N. J. Padelford: Religious Liberty in International Law and Treaties. K. L. Butterfield: Rural Work and Mission Policy. E. D. Soper: Christian Education in Japan. R. Kilgour: Bell 'The Religion of Tibet.' W. Paton: Toynbee (ed.) 'Survey of International Affairs, 1930.' L. E. Browne: Arnold and Guillaume (ed.) 'The Legacy of Islam.' J. Foster: 'Religious Education in the Chinese Church.' A. W. Lee: Soltau 'Korea.'

The Church Overseas (Vol. V. No. 19. July, 1932. Westminster, S.W. 1: Church House). A. W. Davies: The Missionary Societies and the Church. E. F. Spanton: Charles Gore and Missions. W. N. Carter: The Jewish World of To-day. G. Callaway: Fellowship without Frontiers. P. O. Philip: Rural Reconstruction in India. A. W. Blaxall: The Cape Coloured People and the Church. News from the Dioceses. Quarterly Survey. G. H. Moule: Nitobé 'Japan' (6 pp.), J. W. Welch: Talbot 'Tribes of the Niger Delta.' H. V. Lovett: Anderson and Whitehead 'Christian Education in India.' E. C. West: Oldham and Gibson 'The Remaking of Man in Africa.' R. W. Howard: Shillito 'Craftsmen All.' R. Rouse: Kagawa 'New Life through God.' W. H. Aldis: Baldwin 'Living Pearl' (laudatory). C. A. N. Trollope: Soltau 'Korea.' D. M. Horne: Wilson 'The Wake of the Southern Cross.' C. S. Gillett: Gore 'Charles Gore, Father and Son.' B. T. Gibson: Underhill 'Liberty for India.'

Books Received.

Biblical.

Irwin, C. H.—*The Bible, the Scholar and the Spade*, pp. 251. (R.T.S.). 7*s.* 6*d.*

Meecham, H. G.—*The Oldest Version of the Bible*, pp. 371. (Holborn Publishing House). 5*s.*

Lods, A.—*Israel*, pp. 512. (Kegan Paul). 25*s.*

Robinson, T. H., and Oesterley, W. O. E.—*A History of Israel.* 2 Volumes, pp. 496 and 500. Each 15*s.*

Smith, J.—*Synoptic Tables.* (Berean Press, Birmingham). 2*s.*

Theological and Philosophical.

Heiler, F.—*Prayer*, pp. 376. (Oxford University Press). 16*s.*

Chapman, J. A.—*An Introduction to Schleiermacher*, pp. 165. (Sharp). 6*s.*

RADHAKRISHNAN, S.—*An Idealist View of Life*, pp. 351. (Allen & Unwin). 12*s.* 6*d.*

FROST, B.—*The Rational Faith*, pp. 152. (Philip Allan). 3*s.* 6*d.*

MINGANA, A., ed. by.—*Woodbrooke Studies, Vol. V*, pp. 240. (Heffer). 21*s.*

NEWSOM, G. E.—*The New Morality*, pp. 319. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson). 6*s.*

MCKERROW, J. C.—*An Introduction to Pneumatology*, pp. 179. (Longmans). 6*s.*

HISTORICAL.

GOUGAUD, L.—*Christianity in Celtic Lands*, pp. 458. (Sheed & Ward). 18*s.* See Review.

LAWLOR, H. J.—*The Reformation and the Irish Episcopate*, pp. 47. (S.P.C.K.). 1*s.*

CHURCH, F. C.—*The Italian Reformers*, 1534–1564. (Columbia Univ. Press. Humphrey Milford). 31*s.* See Review.

The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. VII, pp. 1073. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 50*s.*

DIBDIN, L.—*Establishment in England*, pp. 185. (Macmillan). 7*s.* 6*d.* See Review.

BUCKLE, G. E.—*The Letters of Queen Victoria. III Series. Vol. III*, pp. 662. (John Murray). 25*s.* See Review.

LACEY, T. A., Introduction by.—*The King's Book*, pp. 165. (S.P.C.K.). 6*s.*

STEWART, H. L.—*Modernism Past and Present*, pp. 369. (John Murray). 12*s.*

WHITNEY, J. P.—*Hildebrandine Essays*, pp. 184. (Cambridge Univ. Press). 10*s.* 6*d.*

GALTIER, P.—*L'Eglise et la Rémission des Péchés aux Premiers Siècles*, pp. 511. (G. Beauchesne). 34 *francs.*

JACOB, E. F.—*Two Lives of Archbishop Chichele*, pp. 56. (Manchester Univ. Press). 2*s.*

MURGATROYD.—*List of Current Periodical Publications*, pp. 71. (Manchester Univ. Press). 1*s.* 6*d.*

DODD, C. H.—*The Gospel Parables*, pp. 17. (Manchester Univ. Press). 1*s.*

CONWAY, R. S.—*The Etruscan Influence on Roman Religion*, pp. 22. (Manchester Univ. Press). 1*s.* 6*d.*

THOMPSON, E. M.—*A Fragment of a Witham Charterhouse Chronicle*, pp. 27. (Manchester Univ. Press). 1*s.* 6*d.*

VARIOUS.

HARDWICK, J. C.—*A Professional Christian*, pp. 304. (Jonathan Cape). 7*s.* 6*d.* See Review.

ROMIEU, E. and G.—*The Life of George Eliot*, pp. 370. (Jonathan Cape). 7*s.* 6*d.* See Review.

BANISTER, E.—*The Progressive Pilgrim*, pp. 256. (Houghton). 5*s.*

THADANI, N. V.—*The Garden of the East*, pp. 127. (Bharat Publishing House, Karachi). 5*s.*

SPAULL, H.—*The World's Weapons*, pp. 48. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson). 1*s.*

DAVISON, W. T.—*The Living Word in a Changing World*, pp. 266. (Sharp). 6*s.*

MASSINGHAM, H. J. and H., Edited by.—*The Great Victorians*, pp. 550. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson). 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Reception Office, pp. 7. (S.P.C.K.).

LOCK, W.—*Oxford Sermons*, pp. 168. (Oxford University Press). 6*s.*

Lock, W.—*Oxford Memories*, pp. 121. (Oxford University Press). 6*s*.

Hilton, J.—*Contango*, pp. 287. (Benn). 7*s*. 6*d*.

Wilson, H. A.—*E*. 2, pp. 199. (Knott & Son). 3*s*. 6*d*.

Malins, J.—*Joseph Malins*, pp. 190. (Templar Press, Birmingham). 5*s*.

Teape, W. M.—*The Secret Lore of India*, pp. 345. (Heffer). 12*s*. 6*d*.

Bullett, G.—*The Testament of Light*. (Dent). 5*s*.

German Books.

Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2, *Auflage*, *Registerband*. 896 columns. (J. C. B. Mohr. Paul Siebeck, Tübingen). 26 *marks*.

Kittel, G., edited by.—*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, *Vol. IV*., pp. 256. (W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart). 2.90 *marks*.

Schomerus, H. W.—*Parallen zum Christentum als religionsgeschichtliches und theologisches Problem*, pp. 53. (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh). 1.50 *marks*.

Lütgert, W.—*Adolf Schlatter als Theologe*, pp. 52. (C. Bertelsmann). 1.50 *marks*.

Schlunk, M.—*Die Weltreligion und das Christentum*, pp. xv+190. (C. Bertelsmann). 4.50 *marks*; cloth, 5.70 *marks*.

Dalman, G.—*Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, pp. xv+350. (C. Bertelsmann). 21 *marks*; cloth, 24 *marks*.

Von Walter, J.—*Die Geschichte des Christentums*, *I*, 1 : *Das Altertum*. pp. v+238. (C. Bertelsmann). 6 *marks*; cloth, 7.50 *marks*.

Schlatter, A.—*Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*, pp. vii+270. (C. Bertelsmann). 14 *marks*; cloth, 16 *marks*.